

Training  
for  
Librarianship  
before  
1923

020.71 V26t

Vann

61-13519

Training for librarianship before  
1923

020.71 V26t

61-13519

Vann \$7.00

Training for librarianship before  
1923

kansas city



public library

kansas city, missouri

Books will be issued only  
on presentation of library card.  
Please report lost cards and  
change of residence promptly.  
Card holders are responsible for  
all books, records, films, pictures  
or other library materials  
checked out on their cards.

4-25

KANSAS CITY, MO PUBLIC LIBRARY

01 001 0251835 4





---

# Training for Librarianship before 1923

Education for Librarianship

Prior to the Publication of Williamson's Report on

*Training for Library Service*

BY SARAH K. VANN

---

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Chicago 1961

Copyright © 1961 by the American Library Association

Manufactured in the United States of America

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 60-11837

TO

CHARLES CLARENCE WILLIAMSON



---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was prepared and submitted originally as a doctoral dissertation to the faculty of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago. I am indebted to my advisers in the School, especially Dr. Lester Asheim, Dean, for advice and counsel in its planning, revision, and completion.

It is with pleasure that I acknowledge further my indebtedness to the following for their contributions:

To Dr. C. C. Williamson for permitting me to use his archival materials relating to his study on *Training for Library Service*. Included in that material is a copy of the report, "Training for Library Work," transmitted to the Carnegie Corporation of New York in 1922, and the summary of that report made by Williamson for the Trustees of the Corporation.

To the Carnegie Corporation of New York for permitting me to use the confidential report, *Memorandum concerning Library Schools*, prepared for the use of the Board of Trustees, and for making available a copy of Alvin S. Johnson's *A Report to Carnegie Corporation on the Policy of Donations to Free Public Libraries*, submitted by Johnson in 1916.

To Miss Anita M. Hostetter, former Executive Secretary of the then Board of Education for Librarianship of the American Library Association, for permitting me to examine the files of the Board, wherein I found a few pertinent records dealing with the period encompassed by this study.

To the Association of American Library Schools for permission to examine its documentary materials when Dr. Howard Winger was serving as Secretary.

To Oberlin College, especially to Julian S. Fowler and Mary C. Venn, for permitting me to examine the correspondence files of Azariah Smith Root, who served as chairman of the Committee on Library Training from 1909 to 1919.

To the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, which generously permitted me to gather for myself and to keep for indefinite periods the volumes

of periodicals and books from which I culled many references pertaining to library training.

To Miss Hostetter, Dr. Williamson, and Dr. Phineas L. Windsor, who re-created, through their conversations, aspects of the early period.

And, finally, to the American Library Association for its interest in publishing this study.

---

## C O N T E N T S

Introduction, 1

### Chapter I

BEFORE FORMAL TRAINING: METHODS OF SECURING TRAINING, 4

Through Experience and Inquiry, 5

Through Reading the Literature, 10

Through the Activities of the American Library Association, 18

### Chapter II

TOWARD A FORMAL TRAINING PROGRAM: DEWEY AND THE  
COLUMBIA COLLEGE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY ECONOMY, 22

Dewey's Preliminary Efforts, 22

The Proposed School of Library Economy, 24

Publicity for the School of Library Economy, 29

### Chapter III

AFTER THE INTRODUCTION OF FORMAL TRAINING, 1887-89:  
FROM COLUMBIA TO ALBANY, 39

The Columbia College School of Library Economy, 39

Transfer of the School to Albany, 1889, 50

### Chapter IV

THE NEW YORK STATE LIBRARY SCHOOL TO 1893, 53

The New York State Library School and Its Reception, 53

Criticisms of Training, 58

### Chapter V

EMERGENCE OF NEW TRAINING PROGRAMS IN THE NINETEENTH  
CENTURY, 63

Successful Programs Established by 1891, 64

Proliferation of Programs, 67

### Chapter VI

IN THE LAST DECADE: PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, 79  
Reactions and New Proposals, 1893-97, 79

Library Training as Viewed after a Decade at the Chautauqua Con-  
ference, 84

Josephson's Proposed Curriculum, 1900, 90

The Conference of 1900: Committee Reports and Recommendations, 92

Chapter VII

INTO THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: FROM 1901 TO 1905, 100

Committee on Library Training, 1901-2, 100

Criticisms and Proposals from Other Sources, 101

The Committee on Library Training, 1903, 107

Endorsement of the 1903 Report by the New York Library Association, 115

Criticisms of Library Schools, 1903, 116

Carnegie's Contributions to Library Training, 118

Chapter VIII

IN PURSUIT OF LIBRARY TRAINING STANDARDS, 1905-6, 122

Association Restrictions concerning Training, 122

Report on Standards of Library Training, 1905, 123

More Views on Training, 127

Applying the Standards, 1906, 133

Chapter IX

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY TRAINING:

PUBLISHING A TRACT AND ESTABLISHING A SECTION, 138

Publishing a Tract on Training for Librarianship, 138

Establishing a Section on Professional Training, 142

Chapter X

THE LIBRARY SCHOOLS: FROM 1911 TO 1919, 151

Within the Schools, 151

The Official Examination of Library Schools by the Committee on Library Training, 157

Association of American Library Schools: Its Standards, 163

Continuing Criticisms, 1915-19, 164

Chapter XI

TRAINING AS VIEWED BY AN OUTSIDE AGENCY: THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK, 169

Inquiry by the Carnegie Corporation, 1915-16, 169

Plans for a Second Inquiry by the Carnegie Corporation, 171

Williamson and "The Need of a Plan," 173

Chapter XII

TOWARD A LIBRARY TRAINING BOARD, 178

Proposal by C. C. Williamson in 1919, 178

Action within the American Library Association, 180

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS, 191

Other Studies To Be Made, 193

Selected Bibliography, 194

Notes, 197

Index, 230



---

## Introduction

Two dates are cited as encompassing the "Dewey to Williamson" period of American training for librarianship: 1887, date of the opening of the Columbia College School of Library Economy under the directorship of Melvil Dewey, and 1923, publication date of the report, *Training for Library Service*,<sup>1</sup> prepared by Charles C. Williamson for the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Little has been written, however, about the period before 1887 or about the intervening years. For example, in 1948 Louis Round Wilson, in evaluating the "Historical Development of Education for Librarianship in the United States," summarily reviewed the highlights of those formative years in five pages.<sup>2</sup> More recently Robert D. Leigh, in four pages, synopsized the "Dewey to Williamson" period in his survey of the evolution of library schools.<sup>3</sup> It is the purpose of this study, therefore, to view more extensively the events leading to the establishment of the first School of Library Economy and the activities, both of individuals and of the American Library Association, as they relate to training, during those intervening years. While primarily limited to the development and problems of library schools, this study, in the early part, includes also references to other types of training programs.

The slight attention given heretofore to this pioneer period has tended to obscure the progress made and the problems encountered by those concerned with library training; at the same time it has magnified the content of the Williamson report. It has also obscured the fact that the report was viewed, at the time of its publication, by Frank K. Walter as a discussion of "mostly matters of open record or common knowledge,"<sup>4</sup> and by Carl B. Roden as containing "little that is new, and even less that is startling, to anyone familiar with library affairs."<sup>5</sup> It was Anne Wallace Howland, director of the Drexel Institute Library School, who first characterized the report as marking in 1923

- an epoch in the history of the development of library training only less important than the action of Mr. Dewey in organizing the first library school at Columbia in 1887.<sup>6</sup>

Williamson's report, however, when viewed in awareness of the

accomplishments and failures of librarians in their efforts to formalize training programs, is factual but lacking in originality. His recommendations were essentially these: (1) education for librarianship should consist of one year of general professional instruction offered to college graduates [or to those possessing an education fully equivalent to that of the college graduate]; (2) the second year of training should be a year for specialization; (3) schools should develop specializations for second-year programs; (4) students, before entering the specialized programs, should have had some practical experience after completing the one year of general professional training; (5) instruction by correspondence, offering opportunities unrecognized by existing library schools, should be incorporated into the instructional pattern; (6) library schools should be affiliated with universities, not with public libraries.<sup>7</sup>

Yet the concepts and ideas on which the recommendations were based, and which are frequently identified with the report, had been prevalent throughout the years following the establishment of the School of Library Economy. For example, two concepts which Williamson identified as fundamental or important to his study were: (1) professional library schools should be organized as departments of universities and (2) professional training should be based on a college education or its full equivalent. Before 1887, however, similar concepts had motivated Melvil Dewey, who managed successfully to fulfill the first—to establish the School of Library Economy in a university environment. He did not fulfill the second until 1902, for he was forced to lower the level of admission in the beginning from that of college graduation to something less.

A major premise of Williamson—his insistence on the need of professional standardization and certification—permeated the report wherein he advised that (1) library schools offer professional training only; (2) an authoritative body be created to assist not only library schools but other training agencies to formulate and enforce standards; (3) that same authoritative body serve also as a standardizing agency for library schools with power to enforce its decisions through its privilege of certifying, without examination, graduates of approved schools. Yet by the time the report had been published, the American Library Association, already stimulated by Williamson's proposals within the Association, had established a Temporary Library Training Board.

The assessment made of the Williamson report on *Training for Library Service* does not diminish its significance as an impetus to the implementation of some of its recommendations. It does suggest, however, an inquiry into the events of the years up to 1923. In those years the movement toward formal training was accompanied by widely diversified programs. Divisive and conflicting attitudes toward training were being expressed in the literature, within the American Library Association, and within the Association of American Library Schools. Throughout the period, nevertheless, germinal references may be found to many of the ideas contained in Williamson's "Summary of Findings and Recommendations," and appropriate citations have been made in this study to the latter.

---

The Williamson reports, both the original one, "Training for Library Work,"<sup>8</sup> transmitted to the Carnegie Corporation in 1922, and the published version, *Training for Library Service*, fall outside the scope of this study. The contributions of Williamson made before 1923, however, either in preparation for the Corporation assignment or within the Association, will be included. It was through Williamson's meteoric ascendancy as a proponent for a library training board and his subsequent efforts to foster its establishment within the American Library Association that his name may more properly be regarded as defining the end of an era than in its being affixed to the Corporation report only.

The detailed analysis of the developments of the ideas and concepts of training for librarianship in the United States during the "Dewey to Williamson" period should provide a clearer historical perspective with which to view events, following the publication of the report, which formerly have been regarded essentially as isolated phenomena.

## Before formal training: methods of securing training

The establishment in 1887 of the first formal library training program at Columbia College as the School of Library Economy was neither an anachronism nor an accident; it was rather one solution, persuasively advocated by Melvil Dewey, to the problem of providing trained personnel for the libraries being established throughout the United States. Although as early as 1874 George Washington Fentress, librarian of the San José Library Association, San José, California, had expressed his belief that special training was needed for library work,<sup>1</sup> he made no effort, so far as is known, to initiate a program. In contrast, the establishment of the School was the culmination of Dewey's own search for an answer to the training problem which he had viewed in 1879 in his "Apprenticeship of Librarians."<sup>2</sup>

That the formalized program might have been premature is arguable; its inevitability not, for the recognition of the need of training seemed to be a practical response to the concept which had permeated the nineteenth century, *Custos librorum nascitur, non fit*, and which had been expressed eloquently by Lloyd Pearsall Smith at the Conference of Librarians in 1876.<sup>3</sup> By that date, however, the century had become an era of public library expansion. As early as 1854 the Rev. John Burt White, a representative in the Massachusetts State Legislature, had predicted the universal establishment of tax-supported libraries<sup>4</sup> and by 1876 his prediction was well on its way to fulfillment. In that year the U.S. Bureau of Education issued its monumental document, *Public Libraries in the United States of America: Their History, Condition, and Management*, which included statistics on public libraries containing three hundred or more volumes. The statistics, though admittedly inadequate, gave information on 3,647<sup>5</sup> libraries, 2,240 of which were established between the dates 1850 and 1875.<sup>6</sup> When compared to the number established between 1825 and 1850—551<sup>7</sup>—the rate of increase was slightly more than 400 per cent. There were increases also in the size of collections, for whereas in 1849 there were 154 libraries with an average collection of 10,580 volumes, there were, in 1876, 266 libraries with an average collection of 26,259 volumes.<sup>8</sup> Within a period of twenty-five years a discernible trend toward the development of

larger book collections was readily seen in the 58 per cent increase in the number of libraries having collections of more than 10,000 volumes.

Because problems of administration were increasingly multiplied as the libraries developed both in size and in concepts of service, the fortuitous acquisition of the details of library economy could not long satisfy the needs of those attempting to organize and to administer the book collections. Yet if it can be assumed that for every library in 1876 there was at least one person responsible for its management, there were more than 3,000 librarians, each of whom had fitted himself for his position according to his ability and opportunity. It is the purpose of this chapter to survey the methods whereby librarians might have acquired some guidance before the opening of the first School of Library Economy; the methods may be identified as guidance (1) through experience and inquiry; (2) through the reading of available literature; and (3) through the activities of the American Library Association.

### THROUGH EXPERIENCE AND INQUIRY

Three early methods of learning to administer a library were identified in 1901 by Mary Wright Plummer, director of the Pratt Institute Free Library and of the Library School, Brooklyn, New York. Her appraisal, entitled "Training for Librarianship,"<sup>9</sup> was viewed by the *Library Journal* as an illuminating sketch of the history of and trends in professional training, and the issue of the *Journal* in which it appeared was designated purposively as a "library training number," largely because of its inclusion.<sup>10</sup> In surveying the nineteenth century Miss Plummer enumerated the methods as:

First, by main strength, each librarian evolving a system of his own from his inner consciousness and that of his board, committing the same natural mistakes committed by the majority of librarians before him, and finally sitting down helplessly in the confusion thus created, solving each difficulty as it came up according to the inspiration of the moment, and occasionally finding the inspiration good. . . .

[Second] Then there was management by imitation. The board of the new library sent the librarian for two or three weeks to some large city library to pick up what he could by observation and by working in some of its departments. Naturally, he took the large library's system bodily back to the small new library, and found out only by long and hard experience that the so-called best is sometimes too good, and that he had to modify, prune, and generally make over the system for a period of years before it fitted the circumstances of his library.

[Third] There was also the opportunity, though a rare one, to learn certain parts of the work of a library by tuition. This was chiefly in college libraries, where one might learn the principles of cataloging, for instance, under excellent catalogers.<sup>11</sup>

Those three methods may be referred to as learning by intuition, by imitation, and by tuition; it appears more likely, however, that the popular method of seeking guidance was through inquiry which sometimes led to an indentureship, or more properly, as it became known, to an apprenticeship. This point of view is supported by the statements of Justin Winsor, who, in his first annual report of 1869 as Superintendent of the Boston Public Library, referred to the time spent in helping other libraries and librarians. He justified the expenditure of time to some extent by explaining that, since there were no schools of bibliographical and bibliothecal training, he regarded it as a duty of his office to share with others his experiences.<sup>12</sup>

#### Winsor's "A Word to Starters of Libraries"

Seven years later Winsor indicated that he had become wearied on occasions by the requests for aid in establishing libraries and expressed his feelings through offering advice to starters of libraries in the newly established *American Library Journal*. In chastising those who had made unwarranted requests, he created a mythical John Brown who might have sent the following letter to a "well-established librarian":

Punkeyville, July 10, 1876

Dear Sir: The Honorable Hezekiah Jones, of our town, has donated [by the way, *given* has dropped out of the dictionary with such people] \$\_\_\_\_\_ to found a library in this his native place, and we wish the library to reflect honor on him and credit on Punkeyville. Accordingly we would be obliged for any information you can give to enable us to establish this trust on a correct basis.

Very respectfully,

For the Committee,

John Brown

P.S.—I hope you will send us your catalogues, your charter, and your rules.<sup>13</sup>

Though acknowledging that Brown might be an estimable person of ability and suitable for the head of the trust, Winsor noted that Brown as a physician would refer one to the "journal of the profession or recommend a course of study in the schools"; that Brown as a lawyer would charge for his professional advice; that Brown as a teacher would have no time. Winsor hastened to assure his readers that he was in no way attempting "to abridge the useful advice which an experienced librarian can bestow outside of his own sphere," but that he was attempting to emphasize that the seekers of information should try to help themselves before directing inquiries to librarians. In answering the question as to how the seekers might help themselves, Winsor offered the following suggestions:

1. Procure what is in print.
2. Send to any library which is a fit exemplar, and ask for its rules and reports.

3. Take time to study all these documents and when you have got a clear idea of what a library is, and how it should be maintained, consider closely the fitness of this or that library to this or that community, or to those conditions under which you are to work.

4. If you have not time, resign your trust to some one who has, and who has a correct appreciation of the old adage that those who help themselves are soonest helped by others.

5. After studying and problems are still unsolved, write to an old librarian but do not be surprised at the diversity of opinion among experts.

6. Choose that which you naturally take to; run to it, and do not decide that the other is not perfectly satisfactory to him who chose that.

7. Whichever you have chosen, study to improve it.<sup>14</sup>

Such an elementary codification must have been a welcome suggestion to the harassed librarians confronted with organizational chaos. The content of the article indicates further that Winsor had given much time and thought to the formulation of a sensible procedure for beginners, for in 1870 his terse advice to a novice seeking information had been, "By doing it."<sup>15</sup>

### Reminiscences of librarians

From the reminiscences of nineteenth-century librarians some insight concerning the training acquired for library positions may be gleaned, though it must be remembered that reminiscences are often romanticized recollections. It was R. L. Davis who recalled that Winsor had advised him that he could learn "by doing it"; the advice presumably was taken seriously for Davis recalled the incident in 1917, forty-seven years later, at which time he was librarian emeritus of the University of Michigan.<sup>16</sup>

One of the most delightful of the recollections was written by James L. Whitney after forty years of service in the Boston Public Library. After a whimsical reference to his having been given in his youth the choice by a fairy "between great power and station and the privilege of living always among books," and that he had chosen the latter, Whitney drew a nostalgic picture of his days at home, at school, and at college. He recalled his introduction to the Boston Public Library thus:

On a visit one day to the Boston Public Library I was introduced by William A. Wheeler, the assistant superintendent, to the shelves. At once came the determination to join him in his work. To this end I bought the catalogs and bulletins of the library. While at Harvard College, Ezra Abbot invited me to that library, especially to his written card catalog, the headings of which I copied. Obtaining the catalogs of the Astor Library and the Library of Congress, the "Memoirs of Libraries" of Edward Edwards, the British Museum publications, and other works, I began upon the study of

them. After a time came an invitation to join the Catalog Department of the Boston Public Library, which I accepted just forty years ago.<sup>17</sup>

William Isaac Fletcher, librarian of Amherst College for twenty-eight years, has also preserved the story of his own preparation for library work in the days before library schools existed. In commenting on his five years at the Boston Athenaeum with William Frederick Poole as his mentor, Fletcher recalled that the years had been for him "both an apprenticeship and a liberal education."<sup>18</sup> In a biographical sketch of Poole, Fletcher praised him for his contributions to those less experienced and less self-reliant by writing:

Dr. Poole was truly a pioneer in librarianship. His work was largely done at a time when there were no accepted standards or methods in the profession, and he was recognized as a leader in the development of library work, whom many were ready to follow. His advice and assistance were constantly sought by less experienced and self-reliant librarians and by those in charge of new library enterprises, and were freely given.<sup>19</sup>

#### Increasing emphasis on experience

Though the distinction which marked the careers of Winsor and Poole lends credence to Smith's theme that librarians were born, not made, increasing emphasis was placed on the value of experience as a prerequisite for library work. This trend, however, seems to have been given its impetus, not so much by a recognition of distinctive content in librarianship, but rather by a concern over the use of political influence in appointments in tax-supported libraries. As a concomitant factor in dismissals such influence was a menacing specter and its invidiousness best illustrated in the resignation of Justin Winsor, as superintendent of the Boston Public Library, because of the machinations of the Boston City Council in 1887. Both because of Winsor's prominence in the profession and because the act was reprehensible, the *Library Journal* reported to its readers on the events leading to the resignation.<sup>20</sup> That such an experience had befallen Winsor, president of the American Library Association, offered little solace to the many librarians in less prominent positions and awakened librarians to a realization that only within their qualifications for holding a position could they have any hope, and that not too well founded, that their appointments could survive changes in political administrations.

Winsor's experience was not the first to be reported in library literature, the first reference being that of February 28, 1877, to the removal from office, through less than fair means, of John Jay Bailey, who was dismissed by the Board of Managers of the St. Louis Public School Library.<sup>21</sup> That the concern of librarians was not merely with protecting their jobs, but rather with establishing the qualifications for them, is illustrated by the *Library Journal's* emphasis on the selection of an incompetent successor rather than on the manner of dismissal itself:



The summary dismissal of one librarian should at least be justified by substituting in his place at the head of an important library an officer who had earned the position by work, experience and efficiency in library management. Instead of doing this, the Board elected as librarian a young gentleman of unexceptionable personal character, but who, from the professional point of view, is open to the objection that he has had no library experience whatever.<sup>22</sup>

Concern over political encroachment extended beyond the pages of the *Library Journal*, for *The Nation* of December 7, 1882, openly attacked political interference in library management. It bluntly advised the politicians:

When one who was evidently a born librarian has also been made by the experience of a number of years, it is very poor political economy, however good politics it may be, to let her services be lost to the State, and take in her place one who has all the experience to gain. A few instructed persons know that to perform the work of a librarian fairly requires months of apprenticeship; to perform it well requires years of practice.<sup>23</sup>

Throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century, librarians opposed political dismissals from office, offering as the major defense the lack of library experience as a qualification,<sup>24</sup> but rarely referring to the personal and intellectual qualities which might well have been considered prerequisites. They did not, however, through their organization, the American Library Association, take formal notice of the trend until the Buffalo Conference of 1883, at which time the following resolution was passed:

That efficiency in library administration can best be attained through the applications of the cardinal principles of an enlightened civil service, viz., the absolute exclusion of the political and personal influence, appointment for definitely ascertained fitness, promotion for merit, and retention during good behavior.<sup>25</sup>

Though the resolution was ineffectual in view of the continuing dismissals for political reasons, such as that of Frank P. Hill, librarian of the city of Lowell, Massachusetts,<sup>26</sup> its approval by the Association implied an increasing concern over the politically divine right being practiced by officials. The vagueness of the phrase, "definitely ascertained fitness," however, weakened the force of the resolution, but it appeared to be, as of the date 1883, a projection of Associational indecision concerning how that fitness might best be attained. That indecision was to manifest itself at the same Conference when Dewey recounted his efforts to establish a formal training program at Columbia College. Before consideration in detail of the events of the 1883 Conference, further attention will be given to the informal methods of preparing one's self for library work—those methods which were successful according to the individual's absorptive or imitative capacities.

### THROUGH READING THE LITERATURE

Winsor's first suggestion to starters of libraries, "Procure what is in print," though reassuring in tone was not practical, for as of that date there was little written which related directly to the problems of library administration. Ainsworth Spofford, librarian of Congress, in preparing his comprehensive "Library Bibliography," which appeared as Chapter XXXVI of the document, *Public Libraries*, acknowledged such a limitation by stating:

While the literature of libraries, if we include the catalogues and annual reports of individual collections, extends to many thousands of volumes, there have been comparatively few books devoted to the general subject of library economy and the history and statistics of libraries.<sup>27</sup>

By 1887, at which time the School of Library Economy had been established, the suggestion could well have been, "Procure what is in print and read judiciously therefrom," for during that brief period of years from 1876 to 1887, a body of literature was created which formed the nucleus of the reading program of formal training for librarianship. The importance of the growing body of literature was recognized by Charles Ami Cutter who, in 1885, replied to the question, "How To Become a Librarian," by advising that one read the essays on library economy which were then available.<sup>28</sup> It is interesting to note that so eminent a librarian as Cutter, only two years before the School of Library Economy was to begin its program, made no call for formal training in librarianship but considered a reading of the literature sufficient.

In the following pages the literature will be divided into three types, each of which will be discussed with some reference to contents: (1) publications from the Bureau of Education; (2) periodical literature; (3) library and private publications.

#### Publications from the Bureau of Education

The publications of the Bureau of Education contributed to the publicizing of libraries and library information, the first evidence appearing in the Report of the Bureau for the year 1870. In that report General John Eaton, Commissioner of Education, undertook the task of collecting statistics on libraries in the country.<sup>29</sup> Similar reports, appearing in 1871, 1872, 1873, and 1874, awakened interest among the participating libraries, among library committees, and other individuals who were broadening their interests in aspects other than statistical, such as evidenced by requests for additional information concerning:

the different plans of organization, sources of revenue, etc.; and asking advice and information on the subjects of library economy and administration, the selection, arrangement, cataloguing, binding,

and preservation of books, the proper buildings, and all the multifarious interests of a public library.<sup>30</sup>

In short, a *manual or textbook of library economy* was requested and was furnished by the Bureau, under the joint editorship of Samuel R. Warren and Major S. N. Clark, as a special report entitled *Public Libraries in the United States of America*. Part I, devoted to the "History, Condition, and Management" of public libraries, presented the "fruits of the ripe experience and best thoughts of eminent librarians"; Part II contained "Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue," prepared by Charles Ami Cutter, of the Boston Athenaeum.

By 1876, then, there was available for the librarian determined to succeed in the field a volume which discussed every administrative aspect of library work, the basic contribution being the chapter on "The Organization and Management of Public Libraries," by William F. Poole.<sup>31</sup> Included also were two articles by Justin Winsor, "Reading in Popular Libraries" and "Library Buildings,"<sup>32</sup> both written about the same time that he was meditating on his words of advice to starters of libraries. His participation in the preparation of the Bureau's report made it possible for him to suggest in his "Word to Starters" that they procure "such volumes, for instance, as the new publication of the Educational Bureau at Washington."<sup>33</sup>

Though the Introduction included a section on "The Study of Library Science" and urged that the librarian "should be granted opportunities for instruction in all the departments of library science,"<sup>34</sup> not one of the eminently qualified librarians advanced a similar proposal. Apparently completely ignored was the translation of Dr. F. Rullman's tract on the study of library science in German universities.<sup>35</sup> American librarians were not ready for a consideration of formalized training in 1876, and by 1883, when Dewey advanced his plan, no reference was made to Rullman's earlier advocacy of such training.

### *Other publications*

Other publications which appeared under the imprint of the Bureau of Education were, in some instances, reprints of chapters in the 1876 report. Among them were *College Libraries as Aids to Instruction*, 1880, which included "The College Library," by Justin Winsor and "Rochester University Library—Administration and Use," by Professor Otis H. Robinson; *Construction of Library Buildings*, 1881, by W. F. Poole; *Organization and Management of Public Libraries*, 1881, by W. F. Poole; and *Library Aids*, 1881, by Samuel Sweet Green.<sup>36</sup>

Before 1887 it would have been possible to gather the documents being issued by the Bureau of Education and, by following Winsor's third suggestion, "Take time to study," arrive at decisions with some degree of confidence.

### Periodical literature

#### *Before 1876*

The issuance in 1876 of a journal limited to the problems of

librarianship presaged the identification of librarianship as an activity with specialized problems and solutions thereto. It would be less than accurate to assume, however, that prior to that date no journalistic outlet was available to the librarian. The invitation to the Librarians' Conference of 1853 had appeared in the pages of *Norton's Literary Gazette* for May 15, 1853,<sup>37</sup> and the proceedings, which otherwise might have been lost or abridged, appeared later in *Norton's Literary and Educational Register* for 1854.<sup>38</sup> The fact that Charles C. Jewett, librarian of the Smithsonian Institution, had contemplated publishing a bulletin similar to *Norton's Literary Gazette* but abandoned the venture after a discussion with Charles B. Norton<sup>39</sup> indicated the prestige and quality of the *Gazette*, as well as the service it was offering to librarians.

A periodical, begun after the 1853 Conference and edited by one of the conferees, Henry Barnard, was the *American Journal of Education*, published during the years 1855 to 1881. The *Journal* included among the thirty-three subjects to which it had contributed:

Libraries; with hints for the purchase, arrangement, catalogueing, drawing and preservation of books, especially in libraries designed for popular use.<sup>40</sup>

There were also related subjects which gave the librarian insight into problems other than administrative and technical: for example, in Volume II, there was a section on "Hints on Reading,"<sup>41</sup> which included an early subjective study on the "Importance of Reading to the Business Man, the Mechanic, and the Manufacturer."<sup>42</sup>

*Publishers' Weekly*. The most readily identifiable precursor of the *Library Journal* is the *Publishers' and Stationers' Weekly Trade Circular*,<sup>43</sup> which appeared in 1872 and has been in continuous existence since that date. Frederick Leypoldt, founder and first editor of the *American Catalogue*, also edited and published the *Publishers' Weekly*. The early issues contained many references to librarians in a section entitled "Literary and Trade Gossip," but beginning with the issue of January 10, 1874, a section entitled "The Library Corner" was included.

It was to the editor of "The Library Corner" that George Washington Fentress, librarian of the San José Library Association, made in 1874, as far as is known, the first public reference to the need of special training for librarianship. In a letter acknowledging his pleasure over the appearance of the new section, Fentress wrote, "We need men educated for library work." He added, "I think it is a distinct profession and should have special training."<sup>44</sup> Neither Fentress<sup>45</sup> nor any other librarian, however, pursued the subject of the librarian's need for special training through the pages of the *Publishers' Weekly*.

Since it was to be Melvil Dewey rather than Fentress who, five years later, was to proclaim with more vigor librarianship as a profession and who was to foster the development of a formal training program, it is interesting to note that in the first compilation of "The Library Corner" the following prediction about Dewey appeared:

Mr. Melvil Dewey, of the graduating class at Amherst College, has practical charge of its library, and promises to become a valuable addition to the ranks of librarians, since he intends pursuing that profession.<sup>46</sup>

Through this section, the *Publishers' Weekly* provided for the librarian, from 1872 to 1876, brief but pertinent information both on personalities and development in the field of librarianship; it also offered its pages for communication from librarians. That Leyboldt was increasingly aware of the needs of librarians for more detailed and direct communication can be seen in the issue of May 20, 1876, in which he informed his readers that an American library journal, under the editorial management of a specialist, was being proposed and would be issued from his office.<sup>47</sup>

Within a period of five months, in the *Publishers' Weekly* for October 7, 1876, appeared the formal announcement that "The first number of the *American Library Journal*, dated September 30, has made its appearance."<sup>48</sup> Its managing editor was identified as Melvil Dewey; Richard R. Bowker, general editor.

#### *After 1876: the Library Journal*

That an educational intent permeated the plans of the editors of the new *Journal* seems certain. On the "Prospectus" announcing the birth of the *Journal* into the periodical world appeared the following quotation by Justin Winsor, which had been extracted from his 1869 annual report as superintendent of the Boston Public Library:

We have no schools of bibliographical and bibliothecal training whose graduates can guide the formation of and assume the management within the fast increasing libraries of our country, and the demand may, perhaps, never warrant their establishment; but every library with a fair experience can afford inestimable instruction to another in its novitiate; and there have been no duties of my office to which I have given more hearty attention than those that have led to the granting of what we could from our experience to the representatives of other libraries, whether coming with inquiries fitting a collection as large as Cincinnati is to establish, or merely seeking such matters as concern the establishment of a village library.<sup>49</sup>

The "Prospectus" further identified the purpose of the *Journal* as being "eminently practical," and, as if in fulfillment of that purpose as well as to support his view of 1869, Winsor contributed, to Volume I, the leading article, "A Word to Starters of Libraries," which met the criterion of eminent practicality.

With the second issue (Nos. 2-3), which reported in detail the Conference of Librarians held at Philadelphia in 1876, a precedent was established which continued until 1907—the inclusion of the proceedings of the American Library Association. Beginning with Volume I, No. 6 (February 28, 1878), the *Journal* was designated the "Official Journal of the American Library Association." As the official organ, the *Journal*

contained information on transactions, proceedings, and committee appointments and, in so doing, strengthened the tenuous structure of the youthful association in its efforts to have an enlightened membership.

For a few years, American librarians were able to read also in the pages of the *Journal* the organizational records and proceedings of the Library Association formed in England. From Volume II, Nos. 5-6 (January-February, 1878), to Volume VII, No. 6 (June, 1882), the *Journal* had as a subtitle, "Official Organ of the Library Associations of America and of the United Kingdom." The proceedings of the Conference of Librarians, held in London in 1877, included a discussion of "The Executive of a Library—Their Qualifications, Functions, Vacation, and Salaries [*sic*]." <sup>50</sup> In the proceedings, the American librarian could read that John Winter Jones, librarian of the British Museum and president of the Conference, had expressed his opinion

that the qualifications of librarians cannot be too high or too catholic, and that librarians ought to be good linguists. They ought also to be good administrators, to be prepared to exercise a strict and personal superintendence over the library staff, and to give their attention to details, however ordinary or minute. <sup>51</sup>

For those disinterested in or unconcerned with associational activities, the *Journal* served as a practical guide or as an elementary text, that service being offered through such articles as the six on "How To Start Libraries in Small Towns" <sup>52</sup> and Winsor's article on "Reference Books in English," written to "equip a *small library* in a way that will equally serve the public and assist the librarian in his duties." <sup>53</sup>

Notes and Queries. Among the special features of the *Journal* included to stimulate the participation of librarians were those identified as "Communications," "General Notes," and "Notes and Queries." <sup>54</sup> To each of these, librarians were urged to make contributions, thereby assisting the *Journal* to "collate for the librarian every view or fact which may be of use or interest in his work, to the saving of time, money and effort." <sup>55</sup> Because of the co-operation from the reporting librarians, the column, "Notes and Queries," particularly reflected the problems, both seemingly trivial and important, which concerned the librarians. The column, retained until November, 1885, during which time Dewey was editor from 1876 to 1880 and Charles A. Cutter, from 1880 to 1885, was characterized by an extreme practicality of both questions and answers.

In a study of the contents of "Notes and Queries," Peggy Neal found that 373 items appeared in the ten-year period; that half of the questions and comments came from libraries which by 1887 had 30,000 volumes; that half of the co-operating librarians were employed in the northeastern section of the United States. <sup>56</sup> Such a response from the northeastern section was not unexpected because of the rapid development of libraries in that area. More significant is the fact that the larger libraries were asking the questions, were experimenting and exploring, whereas the librarians of the small libraries were inarticulate even though many

of the major articles in the *Journal* were planned with their needs in mind.

In tabulating the contents of "Notes and Queries," Miss Neal concluded that one third of the questions or, more specifically, 35.2 per cent, were concerned with the problems of indexing, cataloging, classification, and shelving; that problems of circulation and readers accounted for 22 per cent of the questions; that practical matters of library economy—that is, problems pertaining to the library building, equipment, funds, etc., problems of binding and repair, and comments on timesavers, such as labor-saving devices—accounted for 22.3 per cent of the questions. Topics receiving minimal attention were those relating to "Bibliography" (5.3 per cent); "Cooperation" (3.5 per cent); "Book Selection" (1.7 per cent); "Periodicals and Documents" (5 per cent); and the elusively identified topic of "Librarianship," into which 3 per cent of the comments were grouped by Miss Neal. Under the heading, "Miscellaneous," were grouped 2 per cent of the comments; these were the humorous remarks which appeared at intervals. The early emphasis on cataloging and classification in the curricula of library schools was a fulfillment of the needs of the time if "Notes and Queries" really reflected the librarians' preoccupation with the organizational aspects of the work.

Not one inquiry related to the securing of training, and only one editorial comment referred to the value of training, that being "Learning the Ropes." In it Dewey recommended to aspirants a thorough familiarity with all aspects of library work, to be gained by beginning with the simplest thing to be done about the building and following through on the work in all departments. As if recounting his own experience, Dewey quoted the following:

"As a result, I got at my own proper share of the work some months later, but I knew just what work I needed to attend to personally, and I knew of every other kind of work, when it was properly done, how long it ought to take, and just what kind of a person could do it most successfully. . . . I attribute much of my success in managing my large number of assistants to the preliminary training to which I subjected myself."<sup>57</sup>

Included also in the column was the compliment paid to American librarians because of their zeal in learning about library work. Identified as "Praise Indeed!" the compliment predicted:

"If Americans go on learning how to be librarians in the energetic way they have been, they will soon make their country the school of the world for library economy and management."— *Notes and Queries* (London), Sept. 20th, 1879.<sup>58</sup>

The suggestion that America would become the school of the world for library economy could not have gone unnoticed by Dewey, for at the time of its inclusion he was still editing the column. He made no editorial comment but he had earlier, in his discussion of "Apprenticeship of

Librarians," stated, "We need a training school for preparation for the special work."<sup>59</sup> Within a period of less than ten years, Dewey was to implement his proposal, but during the intervening years the *Library Journal* was creating a body of literature which would serve as instructional material for the formal training programs to emerge after 1887.

#### *Omissions from Spofford's "Library Bibliography"*

In 1876 when Spofford compiled his "Library Bibliography," he failed to include any reference to the *American Journal of Education* or to the *Publishers' Weekly*. Both omissions appear unjustifiable on the basis of the material presented in this paper. Omitted also, because it appeared almost simultaneously with the document, *Public Libraries*, was the contribution from John Fiske, "A Librarian's Work," which appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* and which attempted to refute the insinuation that his connection with Harvard College Library, "being virtually a sinecure office (!) it must leave so much leisure for private study and work of a literary sort."<sup>60</sup>

#### *Other periodicals*

Included, however, in Spofford's list were the names of twenty-six periodicals, chiefly British and American, which contained one or more references to libraries, but only the most experienced librarians could have been expected to extract from the articles pertinent information. Like the books included, the periodical references offered no solution to the vexing administrative problems and rudimentary needs of the small library; it was not until the *Library Journal* made its appearance that a medium of continuing communication attempted to aid the librarians.

Cutter specifically recommended the reading of the *Library Chronicle*,<sup>61</sup> which was a continuation of the "Monthly Notes" of the Library Association of the United Kingdom. Published during the years 1884-88, and succeeded by the *Library*, the *Library Chronicle* was similar in content to the *Library Journal*, with articles on library, literary, and bibliographical subjects and with notes and news on the Library Association and its affairs.

In the latter part of 1886 appeared the first issue in the United States of *Library Notes*, owned and edited by Melvil Dewey. In it he stated that its mission would be to assist in "reaching and interesting the apathetic libraries, which still so largely outnumber those imbued with the modern library spirit." The mission was to be implemented by the plan:

To print a little quarterly so practically useful and so low in price that every library would feel it necessary to take it and then with this entering wedge to educate our readers as rapidly as possible to the knowledge that their selfish interests will be served by paying \$5.00 for the *Library Journal*.<sup>62</sup>



Though only four volumes were to appear, Dewey used his periodical as a means of publicizing his plans for formal training.

By the time that the School of Library Economy was opened, there was available a practical body of literature within the pages of three periodicals: the *Library Journal*, *Library Notes*, and the *Library Chronicle*. Dewey later specifically advised those interested in attending the School that they read and acquire, if economically feasible, two of the periodicals, *Library Notes* and *Library Journal*. In the pages of the latter, Dewey added, "was more important matter for the young librarian than he will find in all the rest of the language together."<sup>63</sup>

### Library and private publications

#### *Library publications*

When Winsor advised the starters of libraries that they "send to any library which is a fit exemplar, and ask for its rules and reports," he was acknowledging the instructional value of those materials and, at the same time, increasing the responsibilities of libraries obligated thereby to provide the information. In contrast, Dewey's proposal, which appeared in the same issue of the *Library Journal* as Winsor's, to establish "a museum of comparative bibliography," in connection with the *Journal*, seemed potentially a more satisfactory solution through its plans for centralization than did Winsor's plan for individual solicitation. Dewey proposed that to the museum:

Each librarian is requested to forward at once two copies of each catalogue, class list, or bulletin of any kind; slips used in calling for books; charging-cards, postal-card notifications for delinquents; lists of books reserved, etc.; laws or regulations; forms of application for use; guarantee and reference blanks, and other printed or like appliances.<sup>64</sup>

Dewey's plan, though necessitating a visit to Boston, might have been more immediately rewarding because of the difficulty in identifying libraries as "fit exemplars." From *Public Libraries in the United States*, however, the names of libraries and librarians could have been secured. The chapter on "Public Libraries of Ten Principal Cities" included some libraries which no doubt met the test of fitness.

#### *Private publications*

Spofford cited, in his "Library Bibliography," Edward Edwards' *Memoirs of Libraries* as forming "the only systematic treatise on the subject in the English language,"<sup>65</sup> as indeed it was since its second part, "Economy of Libraries," was the first formal presentation of administrative problems. It is doubtful, however, that Book Four on "Internal Organization and Public Service" was of value to the American librarian since it was not oriented toward the needs of the small public library, particularly the small American public library.

Without comment Spofford listed *The Librarian's Manual*, by Reuben Guild, which contained two parts: (1) a descriptive list of 495 works, in

all languages, on such subjects as "Classification of Books, and Management of Libraries, or Library Economy"; (2) historical sketches of fourteen large public libraries with much space allotted to the Library of the British Museum.

An examination of the 128 titles referred to by Spofford, who, as librarian of Congress, was in a masterly position to view the literature, reveals the paucity of private publications which as of 1876 could have aided in solving the administrative problems of libraries—a paucity which was prolonging the period of administrative chaos in bibliothecal techniques.

A private publication which might easily have escaped notice was the anonymous pamphlet, *A Classification and Subject Index for Cataloguing and Arranging the Books and Pamphlets of a Library* (Amherst, Mass., 1876), had not its creator, Melvil Dewey, been invited to include a detailed explanation of its use in *Public Libraries in the United States*.<sup>66</sup>

The noteworthy additions to library literature before the opening of the School of Library Economy were not, as this brief survey has shown, necessarily the library reports and private publications but rather periodicals and publications from the Bureau of Education. Each, however, contributed to the personalized reading programs and, later, to the formal training programs.

#### THROUGH THE ACTIVITIES OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

During the nineteenth century, two attempts were made by librarians to arrange some formal meeting at which they would be able to present their problems and relate their experiences. The desire for self-enlightenment, achieved through the sharing of experiences, if not openly expressed, was a motivational factor in the planning of both the attempts—the premature effort of 1853 and the successful effort of 1876. After the latter meeting, positive steps were taken to insure the formation of a permanent organization which, as the American Library Association, was established:

for the purpose of promoting the library interests of the country, and of increasing reciprocity of intelligence and good-will among librarians and all interested in library economy and bibliographical studies.<sup>67</sup>

The first Constitution, prepared by Justin Winsor, president of the Association; Ainsworth Spofford, William F. Poole, and Henry A. Holmes, vice-presidents; and Melvil Dewey, secretary, stated as its objects in Article II:

To promote the library interests of the country by exchanging views, reaching conclusions, and inducing coöperation in all departments of bibliothecal sciences and economy; by disposing the public mind to the founding and improving of libraries; and by cultivating good-will among its own members.<sup>68</sup>

Between the dates 1877 and 1882, four conferences were held for which the subject matter was similar to the contents of "Notes and Queries" and was in certain areas, such as cataloging and classification, similarly emphasized.<sup>69</sup> No less important than the actual program meetings and the proceedings, available to those not attending through the *Library Journal*, were the decisions of the Cooperation Committee,<sup>70</sup> which was more effective in unifying library practices than were the frequently unresolved discussions at the annual conferences. The Committee functioned as a centralized, cohesive agency in achieving uniformity in equipment, procedure, and style. Its early reports, containing decisions on standard sizes, size of the catalog card, form of the shelf list, rules for lending, and standard abbreviations for use in cataloging, served as an organizational and instructional manual for librarians before a formal training program was introduced.

#### Development of the concept of the need for training

Not only did the Associational meetings serve as educational forums; references were also made to the need for training, although no definite proposal was forthcoming until the Buffalo Conference of 1883. It was at the second conference in 1877 that Winsor spoke of training and education, but not in the sense of a formal, preparatory period. In his presidential address, which praised the Association for having organized itself successfully, he proclaimed:

We have vindicated the profession before the ordinary working-day world, and have brought those who by training can best affiliate with us to a better conception of the work a librarian can do.<sup>71</sup>

Winsor might more accurately have described those "who can best affiliate" with the Association as those who by *experience*—not by *training*—had acquired a knowledge of library administration, for he made no reference to any method of securing training or to the needs of a formal education. Implicit in his statement, however, that through affiliation with the Association one would have "a better conception of the work a librarian can do," was the acceptance of the educational function of the Association.

Winsor referred to *training* again when he stated:

There are still corporators and civic councillors who conceive that the extent of a librarian's duties is to pass books over a counter, and who fancy there is no special training necessary to administer.

He warned further that

Until the profession itself can educate its successors in numbers equal to the growth of libraries, we must expect that men who have failed in the shop, in the school-room, and in the pulpit will successfully urge their claims upon easy-going committees.<sup>72</sup>

Unfortunately Winsor offered no specific proposal insuring the education

of successors or even contemporaries; nor was the subject discussed further at the Conference of 1877.

Despite the comment made by Winsor, and despite Dewey's anticipation that there would be some incidental discussion of the training of librarians at the 1879 Conference,<sup>73</sup> it was not until the Washington Conference of 1881 that the subject of the "Training of Library Assistants" was included on the agenda. Inclusion did not insure presentation, however, because, as a result of poor scheduling and crowding, Frederic Vinton, a distinguished and charter member of the Association, refused to participate in the program as planned.<sup>74</sup>

The Conference was not totally devoid of references to training, however, for Samuel S. Green, in analyzing the contents of the five volumes of the *Library Journal* and *Public Libraries in the United States*, included a section on the "Need of Trained Librarians." In it he cited three references, which represented the total coverage for a six-year period: (1) "Library Science: A Special Study at the (German) Universities," by Rullman; (2) "Apprenticeship of Librarians," by Dewey; (3) "Consulting Librarianship," by Dewey.<sup>75</sup> Green's evaluative remarks, if any were made, were not included in the proceedings of the Conference, but the citations alone strengthened Dewey's identification as a proponent of a systematized training program.

Though Vinton's speech was not made at the Cincinnati Conference of 1882, Winsor had included as a topic, "The Best Method of Selecting and Training Library Assistants," to have been discussed originally by the Hon. Mellen Chamberlain, librarian of the Boston Public Library. In his absence the topic was discussed by James Lyman Whitney, also of the Boston Library. Concerning the *selection* of assistants, Whitney would have accepted only those worthy of membership in the profession because

There are few positions where the difference between an educated and an uneducated assistant is so marked as in a library, or where poor work is so fatal.<sup>76</sup>

After citing such qualities as good physical stock, habits of order and punctuality, and amiability, Whitney stressed the importance of an aptitude and a proficiency in language and of "the groundwork prepared for the other sciences which is formed by a college education." As an adopted Bostonian Brahmin, Whitney proposed further that the examination be made not only of the applicant but of his ancestors as well, in order to evaluate the latter's physical and intellectual qualities! For the assistant possessing adequate qualifications, Whitney felt that the librarian should personally revise his work, assist him frequently, allow him time for study, and encourage study outside library hours. He suggested also that the assistant read certain literary papers, such as the *Nation*, the *Literary World*, the *Athenaeum*, the *Academy*, and the *Spectator*.<sup>77</sup>

While applauding the entry into the profession of college graduates, both men and women, Whitney urged that the Convention put itself on

---

record as recognizing that "the need of a higher standard of education in librarians and their assistants has become a pressing one."

According to the proceedings, both Winsor and A. W. Tyler, librarian of the Indianapolis Public Library, related some of their practical experiences in training assistants, but Winsor's remarks were not included. Tyler simply made the realistic observation that the Indianapolis Public Library selected from its substitutes those most likely to make suitable attendants and provided opportunities within the library for them.<sup>78</sup>

In the period between 1876 and 1882, the matter of training was discussed only once and that at the 1882 Conference, which Melvil Dewey did not attend. Though Dewey was not the first, then, to introduce the problem of apprenticeship training or the training of assistants at a meeting, he had expressed his views on the subject as early as 1879 and four years later—at the Buffalo Conference of 1883—was to offer his proposal for the establishment of a School of Library Economy. In the following chapter, a chronological sequence of Dewey's activities as they relate to training before the establishment of the School in 1887 will be made.

## Toward a formal training program: Dewey and the Columbia College School of Library Economy

### DEWEY'S PRELIMINARY EFFORTS

Before Melvil Dewey revealed his interest in a training school for librarians, he had projected himself into prominence as early as 1876, both through his initial interest in a meeting of librarians and in a journal devoted to the problems of librarianship. Moreover, his contribution to *Public Libraries in the United States* dramatized his creative achievements in the recounting of his success with his classification system.<sup>1</sup> As if all those activities were not sufficient, Dewey made a proclamation, with dogmatic assertiveness, in the first issue of the *Library Journal*, that "the time has at last come when a librarian may, without assumption, speak of his occupation as a profession."<sup>2</sup> Though Dewey advanced no proposal in 1876 concerning prerequisite training necessary for membership in the newly proclaimed profession, he appeared to regard the *Journal*, of which he was managing editor, as an educational medium implemented as such by the column, "Notes and Queries," and by the "museum of comparative bibliography." As secretary of the American Library Association, he furthered a consulting librarianship service which offered professional advice, from an expertly qualified librarian, at moderate compensation.<sup>3</sup>

In 1877 Dewey was one of seventeen American librarians—some of the others being Winsor, Cutter, Green, and Poole—who attended the Conference of Librarians of All Nations in London.<sup>4</sup> As at the American Conference, references were made to qualifications, but John Winter Jones, presiding officer, failed, as Winsor had earlier, to present a plan for education, either formal or informal. The delegates were told, however, of plans in Italy for training preparatory to appointment as librarians. Dr. Andrea Crestadoro, librarian, Public Free Libraries, Manchester, relayed the information that

By a recent royal decree in Italy it is ordered that in every National Library (of which there are five) a chair of Librarianship shall be established, to teach and train students in the bibliothecal science, so as to qualify them for appointments as librarians.<sup>5</sup>

Though the American librarians made no contributions to the discussion of formal training, the subject was discussed on the Atlantic crossing by the delegates, among whom "it was generally considered very important that such facilities should be somewhere provided."<sup>6</sup> Green revealed in 1883, long after the voyage, that he had written to Winsor urging that he try to interest Harvard College in undertaking some form of training program for librarians. In contrast to Winsor, who evidenced no interest in pursuing Green's idea, Dewey summarized, within two years after the London Conference, in the *Library Journal*, the reasons for systematic preparation for library work and offered some suggestions as to how that training might be attained.

### Apprenticeship of librarians

Dewey approached the subject of the need of training by observing that "the librarian, whose profession has been so much exalted, must learn his trade by his own experiments and experience." Deploring the unfitness of many, he emphasized his concern for "those who are naturally endowed with the qualities that make our ideal librarian, and who have received the necessary general education." For that group he felt that a "training school for preparation for the special work" was needed. He did not, however, propose the immediate establishment of a library school but, as a palliative, suggested:

The first step to be taken is to arrange systematic instruction and apprenticeship in connection with some of our best managed libraries under the charge of our most enterprising librarians.<sup>7</sup>

He demonstrated the practicability of his plan by proposing that librarians, such as Cutter or Winsor, could take five new assistants, who wanted training but not salaries, meet them each day for talks, guide them in their reading and studying, and give to them the facts, methods, and inspiration not found in print. Though Dewey insisted that he was attempting only to provoke thought and discussion on training, he revealed two of his own ideas: (1) that the students should be instructed by "men full of the library spirit and thoroughly qualified for their work" and (2) that the "librarian's normal school must be attached to some considerable library."

Dewey's proposal did not, as he had expected, stimulate comment, and there is no evidence that either Cutter or Winsor considered seriously the plan or that they made a reply to him. Apprenticeship training was not discussed at the Boston Conference held following the publication of Dewey's idea, but at the 1881 Conference, James L. Whitney repudiated the concept of such training by asserting that

Much, no doubt, might be accomplished in this way if the pupil should prove to be bright and ambitious; but the labors of both librarian and assistant are in too great demand to allow of much time for such instruction. The librarian cannot expect to usurp the functions of the school-master and to add them successfully to his own.<sup>8</sup>

## THE PROPOSED SCHOOL OF LIBRARY ECONOMY

After the failure of the profession to implement the proposal that a program of systematic instruction and apprenticeship be offered by some of the "most enterprising librarians," Dewey assumed a personal responsibility for the establishment of a school. Guided by his concept that a librarian's school should be attached to a large library, Dewey accepted an appointment as librarian-in-chief of the Columbia College Library on May 7, 1883.<sup>9</sup> President Barnard of Columbia College held the opinion that Dewey had accepted because of the assurance given him of hearty support in the creation of a School of Library Economy and that, for the proposed School, Dewey had been willing to make pecuniary sacrifices.<sup>10</sup>

In President Barnard, Dewey found a staunch supporter who submitted a recommendation to the Columbia College Board of Trustees on May 7, 1883, that "they should take into serious consideration the expediency of opening here at an early day a school."<sup>11</sup>

The proposal cited the need for "*trained* librarians animated by the modern library spirit" and stated:

Such a school is called for, not only by the inexperienced who wish to enter upon library work, but by a growing number of those already engaged in it. Of the five thousand public librarians in the United States, not a few would gladly embrace such an opportunity to bring themselves abreast of modern library thought and methods.<sup>12</sup>

Persuasive assurances were offered that: (1) the cost would be trifling compared to the importance of the service; (2) no expensive apparatus would be required; (3) the Columbia College Library would serve as a basis of operation; (4) leading members of the profession were not only interested but would be willing to assist; (5) it was a practicable undertaking for the College to offer the instruction.

Though Dewey's appointment was effective immediately, the Board of Trustees referred the recommendation to its Library Committee of seven members who weighed the matter during the ensuing year.

### Informing the American Library Association

Apparently determined to re-enforce the resolution which had stated that members of the profession had "uniformly shown great interest" and had expressed a "universal willingness to assist," Dewey outlined at the Buffalo Conference, held in August, 1883, details relating to the experiment being considered by the Library Committee of the Board of Trustees.<sup>13</sup> In so doing he appeared to be motivated by a desire to gain the *approval* of the Association for a formal training program.

After an introductory statement relating to the experiment, Dewey informed the Association that Columbia College was committed to no special plan and he justified the establishment of the proposed School



at Columbia because of its library, "already respectable in the number of its volumes, yearly growing and destined to be great." Having read from the report prepared for the Trustees rather than from one prepared for his own associates at the meeting, Dewey asked for suggestions, opinions, and criticisms of the plan. He concluded by assuring the members that

In asking thus earnestly this coöperation we hardly overrate the importance of the proposed undertaking to the library interests of the entire country, in raising our work to the full rank of a regular profession, with its recognized courses of instruction, its certificates and degrees conferred by the University, and chiefly in providing for the new libraries opening almost daily, and for the old ones taking on new life, men and women trained in the best methods, and full of that potent influence which we call "the modern library spirit."<sup>14</sup>

Following an immediate expression of approval of the plan by Lloyd P. Smith, who was a charter member of the Association, Dewey revealed his keen desire to have an official statement of interest in the experiment from the Association by urging that a committee be appointed to report "if found desirable, a resolution expressing the interest of this Association."

Opposition came from William F. Poole, also a charter member of the Association. After identifying such places as the Boston Public Library, the Boston Athenaeum, Harvard College, and other libraries, including his own in Chicago, as institutions of training, Poole stated:

In fact, I have entertained the idea that practical work in a library, based on a good previous education in the schools, was the only proper way to train good librarians. The information cannot be imparted by lectures; and who [he inquired], that is competent, has the time to do the lecturing?

Poole emphasized his objection by adding:

I do not precisely understand what he [i.e., Dewey] intends to do, if anything, beyond what I have stated as desirable to be done, and what every large library ought to be doing. I have the impression, however, that his plan includes something more, such as giving systematic instruction by means of lectures to classes in bibliography, and making it a part of the curriculum in the optional course of studies in Columbia College. Imparted to us as information, it is certainly interesting; and if the scheme shall be put into operation and shall succeed, it will be a very great credit to its author.<sup>15</sup>

In conclusion, he objected to the Association's expressing any opinion as to the practicability of the scheme until it had been in successful operation. In his objection, he was supported strongly by Mellen Chamberlain, of the Boston Public Library, and Dr. J. S. Billings, of the U.S. Surgeon General's Office.<sup>16</sup>

The idea of establishing a school was supported, or at least not objected to, by B. Pickman Mann, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Henry A. Thomas, New York State Library; Charles A. Cutter, Boston Athenaeum; Chester W. Merrill, Cincinnati Public Library; Henry J. Carr, Grand Rapids, Michigan; F. M. Crunden, St. Louis Public School Library;<sup>17</sup> and Samuel S. Green, Worcester, Massachusetts. During the spirited discussion, Cutter made the following discerning comment as to the difference between apprenticeship training and the proposed formal training:

Undoubtedly it is well that a librarian should have worked in a library; there are some things which he will never understand unless he has. But any one merely employed as assistant in a large library is likely to be assigned to one particular department, and to understand that only. And, even if his chief takes care that he shall have variety of work, he only learns the methods of one establishment; and as those are probably all determined upon before he goes there, he only learns them by rote, and, unless he is unusually philosophic, never thinks of the reasons for them. No one is thoroughly fit to have charge of a library who has not pursued some comparative study, and learned to reason about what he does.<sup>18</sup>

After further animadversional comments, Justin Winsor, president of the Association, appointed a committee, upon a motion made by Dr. Billings, "to consider what resolution, if any, could be presented for action." The members chosen were Carr, Chamberlain, Cutter, Mann, and Merrill. When the committee report was made at the seventh session, two reports were presented, a *majority* and a *minority* report, with Mellen Chamberlain the sole minority representative.

#### *The majority report*

The majority report was presented by Cutter, who outlined the difficulties faced by the committee members as they pondered the question and expressed the opinion of the majority as follows:

It seemed to them [i.e., Cutter, Carr, Mann, and Merrill] that the best the Association can do is to greet this disposition with the assurance of its interest and approval, and therefore they recommend the adoption of the following resolution, in which, for the sake of the doubters, we have not committed the Association to any prophecies:

*Resolved*, That this Association desires to express its gratification that the Trustees of Columbia College are considering the propriety of giving instruction in library work, and hopes that the experiment may be tried.<sup>19</sup>

#### *The minority report*

Mellen Chamberlain, objecting to an expression of opinion because Dewey had presented his plan too late in the Conference for examination, presented his minority resolution:

*Resolved*, That this matter be referred to a committee to report more definitely at the next meeting of the Association.

*Discussion and adoption of majority report*

In the discussion following the presentation of the two reports, an objection was raised about limiting the resolution to Columbia College. Dewey justified the limitation by stating that other universities had up to that point signified no interest in establishing such a school.<sup>20</sup>

Green, objecting to Chamberlain's reference to a "hasty utterance," referred to Chamberlain as one mistaken in his views, noting that as early as 1877 the matter of formal training had been discussed, that Winsor had not responded to his letter of inquiry concerning the establishment of a training program at Harvard, and that Dewey had sought his opinion in regard to the proposed school at Columbia College. Unlike Winsor, who remained silent as Green recapitulated past events, Dewey quickly responded, when Green announced that he had insisted that "a school of apprenticeship is also needed," that

The laboratory is to be a central and essential part of the scheme—thus giving Mr. Green's apprenticeship. We plan to have actual work done under the careful personal supervision of an expert who excels in explanation.<sup>21</sup>

The majority report was finally adopted, and upon a motion made by R. R. Bowker, seconded by Dewey and approved, "the president was directed to appoint a committee to take into consideration during the year all projects and schemes for education." By supporting such a motion, Dewey made a step toward effecting a compromise with his opponents, notably Billings and Chamberlain, the former of whom had argued that a general declaration of interest in training problems be made rather than one specifically applauding the step about to be undertaken by Columbia College.<sup>22</sup>

At the end of the Conference, it was evident that Dewey's plan had not received the unanimous approval of the Association and that no subject proposed before 1883 had created a more controversial and divisive atmosphere within the Association than had the plan for a School of Library Economy. Dewey, however, had pocketed the approval which he had sought and, both as secretary of the Association and as the individual to benefit from the resolution, he soon after the Conference transferred to President Barnard the following less than accurate summation:

With the members of the Association of American Librarians, the scheme of such a school, to be somewhere established, has been for some years a subject of discussion and of favorable consideration. The prospect of the early realization of that idea by the action of this institution has therefore afforded them gratification, as promising to supply a want of which they have a clearer appreciation than any other class of persons in society.<sup>23</sup>

To what extent the report, exaggerated both as to the length of time

during which the Association had been discussing the scheme of a school and as to the favorable attitude of the Association, contributed to the decision of the Board of Trustees to approve the establishment of the School is not known, but it can be assumed that the statement was regarded as significant by both Dewey and Barnard, the latter of whom transmitted it to the Trustees of Columbia College in his report on May 5, 1884.

Approval by the Board of Trustees of Columbia College,  
May 5, 1884

The Library Committee delayed its report on the proposed School for a year after Dewey's appointment, not announcing until May 5, 1884, its unanimous approval of the establishment of the

school for the instruction of persons desiring to qualify themselves to take charge of libraries, or for cataloguing, or other library or bibliographical work.<sup>24</sup>

While approving the establishment, however, the Committee cautiously advised that the opening date be not "earlier than October 1st, 1886." The reasons advanced were the necessities of: (1) maturing the scheme of instruction; (2) securing the co-operation of the men on whom the School would rely to carry the scheme into effect; (3) publicizing the program.

The Board of Trustees, in accordance with the favorable recommendation, adopted five resolutions, the first of which authorized the creation of the Columbia College School of Library Economy; the fifth of which confirmed the date of opening as "the first Monday of October, 1886, or at such other date as the Library Committee may fix."<sup>25</sup>

Within resolutions two, three, and four were delineated the administrative decisions. Sole authority for the direction of the School was not transferred to the Chief Librarian; rather, the School was to be

under the superintendence and control of the Library Committee, who shall prescribe the course of instruction to be pursued in it, fix the amount of the tuition fees to be paid by its students, and enact all necessary rules for its government, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.

It was further stated that

The Chief Librarian, under the Committee, and with the advice and approval of the President, shall have the general direction of the School and of the course of instruction so established, with the style and title of Professor of Library Economy.

To the Library Committee rather than to Dewey, as the Chief Librarian, was authorization given to make arrangements to secure the co-operation of experienced librarians or experts desirable for the School. Significantly, however, the resolutions stated that "any expenses incurred may be defrayed out of the fees received for tuition in said School."

The Board refrained from deciding details in the hope that suggestions would be forthcoming from those librarians who had professed an interest in the School, from the expression of needs by those who might attend the School, and from the experience gained by the conducting of preliminary classes within the Columbia College Library.

## PUBLICITY FOR THE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY ECONOMY

By Melvil Dewey

With the assurance that the School would become a reality, Dewey proceeded to compel its success by his efforts to publicize its program, to formulate plans for the curriculum, and to secure the co-operation of the American Library Association. In addition, Dewey conducted, through necessity, a training program for his employees at the Library in which the "pupil assistants" were permitted to participate in all kinds of work and on "lecture days" to discuss and settle questions.<sup>26</sup> The program must have been a mutually rewarding one, for Dewey reported later that, of his staff, four men and twelve women had taken positions elsewhere for which their experience had equipped them.<sup>27</sup> Dewey successfully manipulated the transfer to Columbia College Library of the Bibliothecal Museum more than five months after the Library Committee informed the Board of Trustees prematurely of the accomplishment.<sup>28</sup> The transfer, however, was not authorized until October 29, 1884, at which time the Executive Board of the American Library Association voted to accept the offer of Columbia College Library to deposit the material in its building.<sup>29</sup> In effectuating the deposit Dewey secured for the School some indispensable teaching materials. Between the dates 1884-86, Dewey also edited two publications which were timely media for publicity; they were the circulars of information and *Library Notes*.

### *Circulars of information*

Three circulars were prepared by Dewey, by authority of Columbia College, both to inform prospective students about the new library and to provide information on the School of Library Economy.<sup>30</sup> Each of the circulars reflected, in regard to the School, an increasing refinement of purpose and content. One notable revision in the "Circular of Information" of 1884 offers evidence that Dewey's outline of instruction originally presented to the Board of Trustees, and later at the Buffalo Conference, was inadequate in representing the subject matter of library economy, for in the "Circular," the so-called outline appears in the section devoted to the Columbia College Library. In identifying the services which the library would and could offer the students of the College, Dewey announced that individual aid to readers would be supplemented by a series of lectures which might include: (1) practical bibliography proper; (2) books; (3) reading; (4) "literary methods."<sup>31</sup>

The information was an exact duplicate of that presented by Dewey at the Buffalo Conference, at which time he had warned:

I am reading the first rough draft; that we propose, not to do some specific thing, but to do what shall seem, after consultation, the wisest and most helpful thing to the library interest.<sup>32</sup>

From the circulars of 1884 and 1886-87, the plans for the School were revealed in their formative stages, particularly in the inclusion of information relating to methods of instruction, subjects of instruction, length of course, and admission requirements.

Methods of instruction. It was in the 1884 "Circular" that Dewey made his now frequently quoted statement, "The aim of the School is wholly practical," but it is a misquoted passage since Dewey intended to imply that the School would be experimental in its approach and that the various methods of instruction would be used "in such proportion as experience proves will give the best results."<sup>33</sup>

An applicant, in examining the "Circular," was informed that the methods of instruction used would be: (1) lectures; (2) reading; (3) the seminar; (4) visiting libraries; (5) problems; (6) work. In addition, "object teaching" would be used as much as possible; in such a method the students would be given books, blanks, guides, etc., for examination and, as often as possible, for their own sample files. The reason advanced for the use of many methods of instruction was that

Lectures and reading alone will not achieve the best results in training for librarianship without the conference, problems, study of various libraries in successful operation, and actual work in a library.<sup>34</sup>

In including "actual work in a library," Dewey was fulfilling the promise made to Green at the Conference of 1883; its emphasis as a method of instruction lessened the impact, moreover, of Poole's criticism of Dewey's plan made at the same Conference.

Dewey's use of the "problem method" seems remarkably modern and similar to the "case method" studies of the present day.<sup>35</sup> As outlined by him, the problem method "will test the proficiency of the students and specially will cultivate self-reliance" by posing problems for solution requiring thorough knowledge of the subject.

By 1886 Dewey had restated and identified in more detail the methods first proposed in 1884, and had added to the list the visiting of book houses, the use of all methods when applicable in the study of one topic, and comparative study.<sup>36</sup>

Subjects of instruction. Under the heading, "Subjects of Study," in the 1884 *Circular*, Dewey enumerated a bewildering array of topics, such as:

Developing interest, press, pulpit, school, personal effort; Raising funds by taxes, private bequests, membership fees, lectures, fairs, etc.; Location; Building; Heating, lighting, and ventilating book and reading rooms; Shelving; Furniture and fittings; Labor-saving devices; Trustees and committees; Qualifications necessary in librarian and assistants; Duties, titles, salaries and

vacations; Selection of books and periodicals; . . . Aids to readers; Practical bibliography; Books, choice of editions; Methods of reading; Literary methods; Binding, leathers, sewing, lettering, significant colors; Repairs, etc., etc.<sup>37</sup>

Within two years, Dewey had organized the medley into a coherent and related pattern of fourteen topics "to be treated with more or less fulness, according to their comparative practical importance." They were: (1) library economy; (2) scope and usefulness of libraries; (3) founding and extension of libraries; (4) buildings; (5) government and service; (6) regulations for readers; (7) administration—departments; (8) libraries on special subjects; (9) libraries of special countries or sections; (10) general libraries; (11) reading and aids; (12) literary methods; (13) bibliography; (14) catalogues of general collections.<sup>38</sup>

Before enumerating the topics, Dewey stated that the course would include the antiquarian and historical only when their study contributed to the current problem. Such a decision seemed not an unwise one or one deprecatory of the historical, but simply a realistic appraisal of the School's offering. In contrast to the historical and in an effort to emphasize the timeliness of the proposed curriculum, Dewey made another reference to the practical aspects of the program, noting that

Its aim is entirely practical; to give the best obtainable advice, with specific suggestions on each of the hundreds of questions that arise from the time a library is decided to be desirable, till it is in perfect working order, including administration.

A criticism of Dewey's curriculum, made many years later, that he "enunciated the concept of building up the course content from what today would be called a job analysis of all library work, with a unit of instruction for each identifiable unit of activity,"<sup>39</sup> has exaggerated the pragmatic structure of Dewey's concept of training as found in the fourteen topics. Though Dewey emphasized that the aim of the training was practical, he indicated that practicality was to be measured by one's ability to have a successful career in the library profession. Further, the content of such proposed topics as "library economy," "scope and usefulness of libraries" (with its emphasis on the library as the "people's university"), and "founding and extension of libraries" exceeds the limitations of courses encompassing those activities identified by job analyses.

Length of course. Recognizing that two types of students would be likely to attend the School, those with library experience and those without, Dewey attempted to make provisions whereby both groups could complete the course of lectures and direct instruction within *three months*. Such a provision made it possible for the employed librarians to return to their positions at the end of that period because they

having already had experience largely taking the place of laboratory work, have less need for putting in practice the lessons of the school while under the eye of the instructors.<sup>40</sup>

Dewey maintained, however, that a proper apprenticeship actually consisted of from two to three years actual experience and that, if it were not practicable to remain that long at Columbia College, the apprenticeship should be "secured in some well-managed library."

In thus equating, even with reservations, the uneven training which one had gained by working in a library prior to attending the School or was to be gained by returning immediately after the three months' course with that which would be given in the laboratory programs under guidance, Dewey appeared to be attempting to attract to the School as students persons already engaged in library work. It seems, however, to have been an early failure to discriminate between the advantages to be derived from working under guidance and from working in what might have been a chaotic and poorly organized library.

Dewey outlined also in the "Circular" the program to be followed by those who elected to remain after the three months' course; it was essentially an experience in actual work, four hours daily, under direct supervision and engaged in without further payment of fees but also without reimbursement. The half-days' work was to be considered payment for the instruction given. In addition to the actual work, the students would: (1) continue the courses of reading, seminar, etc., but at less frequent intervals; (2) have weekly conferences with the director; (3) attend classes scheduled according to need by the instructors.<sup>41</sup> Such a plan, early advocated by Dewey but never successfully administered, would have developed in librarianship a pattern of internship similar to that in the legal and medical profession, a similarity to which Dewey himself referred.<sup>42</sup>

Admission requirement. Though Dewey had, in 1879, referred to the education needed by librarians as being a "necessary general education,"<sup>43</sup> he had in 1886 made a deliberate appeal to college-bred women to attend the School of Library Economy.<sup>44</sup> Dewey then presumably would have preferred college graduates, yet he made the following statement in the "Circular" for 1886-87:

While a college education is greatly to be desired as a preparation for this work, it is not forgotten that many of the most successful librarians have not been college-bred, and that the exaction of a degree for admission to the library school might shut out many whose work hereafter would be most creditable.<sup>45</sup>

The realistic admission requirement was clearly stated as follows:

Any person of good moral character presenting satisfactory certificates or diplomas or satisfying the director by personal examination that he has sufficient natural fitness, ability and education to take the course creditably, and thereafter engage successfully in library work, may be admitted to the class.

Dewey's concept of preparation for the profession. Having accepted the realistic admission requirement, Dewey concluded the *Circular* of 1886-87 with his own concept of preparation for the library



profession, which included four qualifications. They were: (1) a college course; (2) the three months' course as designed for the Columbia College School of Library Economy; (3) the completion of one or two years' actual experience in various kinds of library work; (4) a return to the Columbia College School for the three months' course taken again in review.<sup>46</sup>

The prolonged program, as outlined by Dewey, would have provided an opportunity "for laying a deep and broad foundation, and for acquiring the inspiration and momentum essential to that most successful start in one's chosen work." And he offered the final assurance that "the faithful student who has in this way spent two years in training should then be ready to *begin* a successful career in the library profession."

The question, unanswered by the "Circular" and perhaps somewhat obscured by Dewey's proposal for a longer training experience, was who would appear simply as "three months' students." "Faithful students" might also appear, but the immediate plans for the School related to the three months' course.

### *Library Notes*

In addition to the circulars, which manifestly publicized the School of Library Economy, Dewey edited *Library Notes*, through which he circumspectly publicized it. *Library Notes* was published during the years 1886-95 and appeared in four volumes, the first issue of which stated that it was "edited by Melvil Dewey, Secretary, American Library Association, and Prof. of Library Economy in Columbia College."<sup>47</sup> Though the School was formally opened within six months after the appearance of the first issue of June, 1886, the prestige value of Dewey's position as "Professor of Library Economy in Columbia College" must not be underestimated in viewing the publication as a propagandistic medium.

Only two issues actually appeared before the opening of the School, and either through fortuitous planning or definite strategy, the *Notes* were published in a style adaptable for classroom use or for home study. Volume I, No. 1, included practical topics, such as "Cost of Library Equipment," "Book Plates," "Accession Book," "Shelf List," and "Catalog Cards"; it also included theoretical discussion on such topics as "The Library as an Educator," "Libraries, the True Universities for Scholars as well as People," and "Library Employment *vs.* the Library Profession." In Volume I, No. 2, the inclusion of "Condensed Rules for a Card Catalog"<sup>48</sup> made the *Notes* increasingly indispensable as a basic text.

Dewey referred to the School, in the first issue, as the fourth in the quartet of achievements in the library world, the others being the national association, a monthly journal, and the Library Bureau. With each of the four, he related his own participation. For those interested in the School, he urged that they

should apply to Columbia College for its circular about the school since it is the proper purpose of *Notes* merely to stimulate interest enough in its readers so they will seek the information in the regular channels.<sup>49</sup>

In the second issue, more information appeared in the article, "School of Library Economy," in which Dewey summarized the attitudes toward the need of training, after first stating that "one is confronted by the fact that there is absolutely no provision for such training or instruction in either the science or art of librarianship."<sup>50</sup> Though Dewey referred to the Buffalo Conference of the American Library Association, he failed to acknowledge the existence of the divisive mood evidenced or the minority report presented.

It was also in the second issue that Dewey definitely attempted to interest college women in librarianship, for he announced, "We greatly prefer college-bred women in selecting new librarians."<sup>51</sup> His own actions as Chief Librarian of Columbia College Library substantiated his statement because he had employed six Wellesley graduates, who had assumed their duties on August 15, 1883.<sup>52</sup> It was not proclaimed as a new profession for women, however, for as early as 1877 Winsor had reported, "We can command our pick of the educated young women whom our Colleges for Women are launching forth upon our country."<sup>53</sup>

Included also in the same issue was a discourse on the lectures to be given in the School.<sup>54</sup>

Volume I, No. 3, though dated December, 1886, probably did not appear until after the School had begun, for one of the articles, "Columbia Library School," both listed the names of the students enrolled and identified the lectures to be given.<sup>55</sup> Later issues contained the text of some of those lectures; for example, the lecture of W. E. Foster on "A Library's Maximum of Usefulness" appeared in Volume II.<sup>56</sup> *Library Notes* seemed to have become increasingly an organ of the School of Library Economy, but even while more general in scope, it had contributed to the publicizing of the School through the skillful editorial service of Dewey.

### Through the American Library Association

The creation of a committee by the American Library Association at the 1883 Conference to report on schemes and projects relating to the education of librarians assured Dewey that a continuing review of the developments relating to the School of Library Economy would be made. Two reports were made before the opening of the School: the first in 1885 by the Committee on the Proposed School of Library Economy; the other in 1886 by the Committee on the School of Library Economy.

Dewey acknowledged his indebtedness to the Association in the "Circular of Information, 1886-87," wherein he wrote, "The result of their conferences . . . has been general agreement on the plan" which was to be adopted for the first year.<sup>57</sup> By the acknowledgment he implied that the Association had functioned in an advisory capacity only,

and it was an implication which a survey of the committee's activities substantiates.

*Lake George Conference, 1885*

Since there was no meeting of the Association in 1884, the report of the committee was postponed until the meeting at Lake George in September, 1885. It is likely, however, that a report could not have been made in 1884 because of President Winsor's delay in appointing the committee; some of the members received notification of their appointments only about five weeks prior to the Lake George Conference. The delay presumably reflected Winsor's lack of enthusiasm for the entire proposal, though he continued to remain noncommittal. The committee, when finally appointed, consisted of two vice-presidents of the Association—C. A. Cutter, librarian, Boston Athenaeum, and W. E. Foster, librarian, Providence Public Library; and three councilors—S. S. Green, librarian, Worcester Free Public Library; Mary A. Bean, librarian, Public Library, Brookline, Massachusetts; and Hannah P. James, librarian, Free Library, Newton, Massachusetts.<sup>58</sup> Missing from the committee was a representative interested in college and university librarianship, a peculiar omission since the proposed School was to be established in a university or college atmosphere.

In reporting on its immediate assignment, the belatedly organized committee reached the conclusion that

Nowhere, however, within that period, have any "projects and schemes for the education of librarians" been actually put in operation, to the knowledge of the members of this committee.<sup>59</sup>

Not content with its performance, the committee posed two questions which had occurred to its members and tentatively answered them as follows:

Question I. Probing the value of a college education, the first question was: "What portions of a college course, as ordinarily understood, would have been of greatest service to me, in preparation for my duties as librarian?" In responding, the committee emphasized the importance of language, literature, history, and the availability of a large library for study.

After examining the content of college courses, the committee made the practical observation that

By far the greater part of the librarians in actual service have not enjoyed, and will not in the future enjoy, the benefits of a college training, and yet they prove most admirable librarians.<sup>60</sup>

The committee then, and, through it, the Association, put itself on record in 1885 as not feeling that college training was an indispensable qualification for the successful performance of library work. It made no reference, however, to the admission requirements of the proposed School of Library Economy.

Question II. In weighing the second question, "What has my observation of the actual workings of a library shown me to be indispensable in the way of training?" the committee divided the work into three areas: (1) partly mechanical; (2) partly bibliographical; (3) partly administrative. They evidenced concern lest the School over-emphasize the administrative function and expressed their belief that

Successful and efficient administrative work is most securely based on such a previous familiarity with the details of both the mechanical and bibliographical work, as comes only by personal participation in it, from an apprenticeship to it, in fact.<sup>61</sup>

The committee's recommendation. After recapitulating the events leading to the establishment of the School, the committee in conciliatory tone agreed with Poole's statement of 1883 that some large libraries had constituted, and would continue to constitute, admirable "institutions for educating librarians," but admitted that "time can ill be spared for this work of 'education.'" Though the committee spoke favorably of the methods of instruction referred to in the "Circular" and agreed that Columbia College "is likely to be more serviceable in this line than is any other agency at present available," it hesitated to give approval because of the incomplete information. Consequently, in view of lack of details, the committee presented the following resolution:

*Resolved,* That this Association has observed with satisfaction the progress made since 1883 in the direction of a School of Library Economy at Columbia College, and that it trusts a plan more definite in its details may be ready for consideration at its next meeting.<sup>62</sup>

Dewey's response to the 1885 report. The 1885 report, though favorable toward the proposal for a School of Library Economy, contained three admonitions which Dewey could not—and did not—ignore. Those admonitions were: (1) that a college education not be a prerequisite for admission; (2) that the School should not overemphasize the administrative and underestimate the bibliographical and mechanical aspects of library work; (3) that the committee's approval would be withheld until details were announced.

Dewey clarified his position on the requirements for admission by stating in the "Circular of Information" of 1886-87 that though a college education was a greatly desired prerequisite, it would not be required since such a prerequisite might make enrollment impossible for many whose work might be most creditable. Concerning the criticism that the School would overemphasize the administrative aspects, Dewey assured the committee and others that

The plans all contemplate special facilities and inducements for cataloguers, and assistants who do not expect or desire the first place. Special attention will be given to the training of assistants, cataloguers and indexers, without diminishing in any degree the efforts for chief librarians and those who expect to become such.<sup>63</sup>

Dewey evidenced a similar awareness of different fields of library work in his article, "Library Employment *vs.* the Library Profession," which appeared in June, 1886.<sup>64</sup> Not only did Dewey recognize that library work offered "two fields analogous to the work of the public school teacher and the college professor"; he also recognized the difference between what was later to be called "professional" and "clerical" aspects of library work, the latter being the routine work which could be performed by "any intelligent and faithful clerk." Librarians were not prepared at that time to distinguish between the aspects of library work; nor were they prepared by 1923, for Williamson was to include in his report an introductory chapter defining the two terms, "professional" and "clerical," and deploring the failure of the profession to accept the distinction.<sup>65</sup>

Had Dewey at that time developed further the germinal concept of the differences between the work of the public librarian and that of the college and university librarian, and evolved a curriculum for each of the fields, the educational pattern would have developed along quite different lines than that which it was to follow. If he perceived the problem, however, he did not foster such a distinction in the program offered by the School of Library Economy.

Concerning the details relating to the School, Dewey conferred with the committee at a meeting in the Boston Athenaeum in the spring of 1886 on such matters as (1) the opening date for the School; (2) the character of the instruction; (3) the fee to be charged, etc.<sup>66</sup> The results of that Conference were embodied in the "Circular of Information" of 1886-87; at the same time, the committee incorporated into its report the record of the year's association with Dewey.

### *Milwaukee Conference, 1886*

In presenting its second report at the Milwaukee Conference of 1886, Cutter informed the Association of the meeting with Dewey and of the issuance of the "Circular." Apparently, however, Cutter was somewhat appalled by the detailed training program being promoted, for he made his statement, frequently quoted, on the suitable working environment for the graduates of the School:

So I feared for a moment that the young men who are exposed to all the influences of the School of Library Economy will be thought fitted for another world, and allowed to find employment there. But the young women who feel attracted by library-work, judging by those that are already in the profession, will not need the training of such a school,—they are angels already.<sup>67</sup>

Reception of the report. Following the presentation of the report, Dewey asked again for criticism and suggestions and concluded by saying:

We wish the A.L.A. to feel that this school is its school, and that it is its right, privilege, and duty to help form it so as to promote the highest good of American libraries.

There was no official comment concerning either the report or Dewey's proposal that the School be regarded as an Association school; however, the continued existence of a Committee on School of Library Economy and its reports made at the ensuing annual conferences would lead to the inference that the Association was not totally unaware of the significant development for which Dewey was essentially responsible, or that it was isolating itself totally from the venture. The tacit acceptance by the committee of the implication in the "Circular of Information" of 1886-87—that the program for the first year was approved by the Association<sup>68</sup>—further implies that the Association was jointly responsible for the pattern of training for librarianship which was to develop, particularly in regard to the compromises relating to (1) admitting persons without college degrees; (2) practical work; (3) curriculum content.

## After the introduction of formal training, 1887-89: from Columbia to Albany

### THE COLUMBIA COLLEGE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY ECONOMY

As announced, the School of Library Economy opened officially on January 5, 1887, with an enrollment of twenty students—three men and seventeen women.<sup>1</sup> It was from the beginning perilously close to failure, not because of the program, but because of Dewey's insistence on the admission of women in opposition to the wishes of the Board of Regents.<sup>2</sup> It would, however, have been perilously closer had women not been admitted, for it is highly improbable that a School could have been maintained for three students. Thus, despite the administrative crisis which was engendered and which was solved only by Dewey's transference of the School to the New York State Library, the anomaly is that women, in their ready acceptance of formal training, were largely responsible for the continuation of the first formal training program and others which were to be developed afterward. Furthermore, had college graduation been made a prerequisite for admission, only five of the twenty could have been admitted and all five would have been women—the Misses Fernald, Jackson, Miller, Seymour, and Talcott.

Though originally planned as a three months' course, the program was extended at the request of the student body, at the end of the first six weeks, to four months; the first lecture term ending consequently on April 30, 1887. Such an extension was imperative, in view of the heavy schedule of lectures, and also practical for laboratory work. Extra lectures were planned and presented by thirty-five individuals, chiefly librarians, among them being Cutter, Green, Hannah P. Jones, Ellen M. Coe, W. E. Foster, W. I. Fletcher, Reuben Guild, Caroline M. Hewins, J. N. Larned, and E. C. Richardson. Though Mellen Chamberlain and W. F. Poole had expressed opposition to the plans for the School, they too appeared as lecturers;<sup>3</sup> missing from the list, however, was the name of Justin Winsor, who spoke later to the students of the second class.<sup>4</sup> Other distinguished participants and their topics were President Barnard, on "Making a Cyclopedea"; R. R. Bowker, on book-trade bibliography and copyright problems; and G. Haven Putnam, on "Literary Property from the Point of View of the Publisher."

Many of the lectures could have been expanded into supplementary courses and thereby could have encouraged an early specialization of interests; for example, the series of lectures presented by Miss Hewins reflected an interest in children's work; those of William C. Lane, an interest in college library work; and those of Green, an interest in the public library as an educational institution. The topics of their lectures were: (1) for Miss Hewins, "The Reading of the Young," "Bibliography of Children's Books," and "Writers on Children's Reading"; (2) for Lane, "Functions and Methods of a College Library," "Suggestions from the Catalog Department," and "Use of Reference Books in Cataloging"; (3) for Green, "Public Libraries as Popular Educational Institutions," "Libraries and Schools," "The Library in Relation to Persons Engaged in Industrial Pursuits," and "The Distribution of Novels and Stories Regarded from an Educational Point of View." There was, however, no time for the intensification of lecture content nor any manifestation of specialized interest according to the records which have been preserved.

In addition to Dewey, the regular staff of instructors consisted of Walter Stanley Biscoe and George Hall Baker, both Amherst graduates, and Salome Cutler (later Salome Cutler Fairchild).<sup>5</sup> Among those from Columbia College who offered affiliated lectures was Nicholas Murray Butler, Professor of Philosophy and Education, who spoke on "Relation of Psychology to Pedagogy" and "The Training of Memory." The intensity of the course has been commented on by one of the original twenty students, Mary Wright Plummer, who, in relating the experience and the exposure to the medley of lectures, viewed it as

almost a wonder that the ferment of energy and enthusiasm with which we listened to and attempted to follow our instructions did not burst out the walls of the superannuated building.<sup>6</sup>

#### Criticism of the first class

Dewey was most enthusiastic about the success of the first experiment, noting that some of the students had decided to complete the two years' course which he had outlined; that the students had done especially good work under the topic "Buildings," for which problem they were given data on actual buildings about to be erected or remodeled; that the thesis topics, which encompassed all aspects of library planning, building, equipping, and administration, had been handled with a gratifying comprehension; that the class itself had recognized some of its own limitations, particularly the need of languages. Because of that need, the course in library linguistics<sup>7</sup> was to be extended during the second year. A measurement of success cited by Dewey was the recognition from an "unexpectedly large number of libraries that have already applied to the School for assistants." Dewey concluded his own evaluative comment by stating:

The School has proved like the typical A.L.A. Conference except that it has been four months instead of four days, full of hard work but also full of enthusiasm and helpfulness and inspiration to all concerned.<sup>8</sup>



Reactions to the first School of Library Economy were evidenced by others than Dewey for, within the year of its opening, congratulatory phrases appeared in the *Library Journal* and in the annual report of President Barnard. More critical comments were made, however, by the A.L.A. Committee on the School of Library Economy and by Mary Wright Plummer, who made her report at the third session of the Thousand Islands Conference of 1887.

*From the Library Journal*

The report in the *Library Journal* must be regarded as somewhat biased in favor of the School, since the editorial referring to the School was either written jointly or approved jointly by Charles A. Cutter, who was serving with R. R. Bowker as coeditor. Not only had both of them appeared as lecturers in the School; Cutter had presented, in 1883, the majority report encouraging the establishment of the School and he had served on the committee which made a report on the School at the Lake George Conference of 1885. Whatever the motivation, the status of formal training was enhanced by the approval of the *Library Journal*, which hailed the opening of the School, almost simultaneously with its opening, as the event of the library year and added:

The students have of course all the advantages of the very modern improvements in the great library, and a score of pioneers are already in training for a calling which can certainly be called a profession now that it has a professional school. We congratulate Columbia University, as it is entitled to be called, and Prof. Dewey, on the very successful start which has been made. . . . The new school has been born, Minerva like, full-fledged.<sup>9</sup>

A second editorial expression of confidence in library training appeared two months later in a somewhat unexpected fashion. In commenting on three articles included in the issue—"Cataloguing—: A Word to Beginners," by Miss L. A. Williams; "A Simple Lesson in Cataloguing," by Miss A. I. Appleton; and a description of a card catalog in the section, "Cataloguing and Classification—" <sup>10</sup> the editorial concluded, "All three point the same moral, the need of the Library School." <sup>11</sup> In justifying the need, the editorial stated:

Whatever defects there may turn out to be in the Library School, we may be sure that such ignorance of what has been done will not be possible to its pupils. At least they will know what has been written on cataloging and classification, and will be able to stand on their predecessors' shoulders.

A humorous criticism appeared in a poem entitled, "Three Little Maids from the Library School," written by J. Schwartz, who dubbed himself "poet-lariat of the Library School" and who dedicated the poem, by permission, to Melvil Dewey. The poem, seldom quoted now, begins:

Three little maids from school are we,  
 Filled to the brim with economy,  
 —Not of the house but library,  
 Learnt in the Library School.<sup>12</sup>

*From President Barnard*

It is possible that Barnard's defense of Dewey and his own interest in furthering the educational opportunities of women predisposed him to accept Dewey's estimate of the first year's work, for he included in his annual report such statements as:

The success of the School of Library Economy is evidenced by the fact that the applications for admission were so numerous as to call for the exercise of considerable severity.<sup>13</sup>

He referred particularly to the value of the training to the students by informing the Trustees that each student attending had been under solicitation for worthy appointments in desirable parts of the country. No reference was made, however, to the fact that the majority of the students were women.

*At the Thousand Islands Conference, 1887*

From the A.L.A. Committee. At the Thousand Islands Conference, the first held after the opening of the School, the A.L.A. Committee on the School of Library Economy, composed of S. S. Green, W. E. Foster, and Hannah P. James, each of whom had lectured at the School, presented its report. Confirming that the establishment of the School had "fully justified the opinions of those persons who favored" it, the committee extended its thanks both to Dewey and to Columbia College. To Dewey, its thanks for inaugurating the program; to Columbia College, for

its readiness to allow its well-informed and energetic Librarian to carry out his plans for the benefit of education, and our admiration of the faith which made it willing to second a movement by lending its name, affording its support, and giving from its resources to make it successful.<sup>14</sup>

Despite their visits to the School, the committee members, in their optimistic appraisal, gave no hint of the crises and schisms which had preceded the opening of the School, or of the conflicts between the Board of Trustees and Dewey and Barnard in regard to the admission of women. Whether it was an attempt at deliberate suppression of administrative difficulties or whether Dewey successfully prevented their knowing of his conflict is unclear, but presumably he did inform them.

Among the criticisms offered by the committee was that, despite the energy and wisdom of the administration, "something of that quality which is known in art as repose was lacking in the conduct of the exercises of the School." Green, the chairman, warned further of three dangers which he felt that the School would avoid: (1) danger of

"provincialism," of presenting one point of view only; (2) danger of "exaggeration of the importance of instrumentalities by its pupils" to the detriment of emphasis on the spirit of helpfulness; (3) danger of graduates becoming "conceited prigs" in not recognizing that the teachings of experience must supplement knowledge obtained in school or college.

Both Foster, in person, and Miss James, by letter, substantiated Green's major report. Foster expressed pleasure over the *spirit* which prevailed and Miss James, over the *breadth* of the teaching. Miss James perhaps had anticipated the statement by Green on provincialism, for she made a special effort to indicate its absence. She concluded her letter by predicting:

I know I am right in saying that the school will continue to be of the utmost *practical* value, and its establishment marks the beginning of new life and zeal in library administration.<sup>15</sup>

From a student, Mary Wright Plummer. At the third session of the Thousand Islands Conference, the membership of the American Library Association had an opportunity to meet one of the library school students, Mary Wright Plummer, and to hear her speak from a "student's standpoint." Miss Plummer spoke with enthusiasm of the experience, of the group's feeling "that, whatever place and whatever division of labor might fall to our lot, we should not be satisfied with less than our best work, now that we had a standard."<sup>16</sup>

In due order she referred to the curriculum as a whole, to the limitations of time, to the lecture courses, and to note-taking. Of the limitations of time, Miss Plummer offered what has now become commonplace:

The time was all too short, however, to thoroughly conquer the vast amount of detail, and the apprenticeship term was of great value in confirming our uncertain impression of what we had been taught.<sup>17</sup>

Concerning lecture courses, Miss Plummer suggested sensibly that they "be arranged so as to bring together discourses on the same or kindred topics." She also questioned the wisdom of teaching more than one system of cataloging within the time available.

Of note-taking, Miss Plummer admitted that

For one or two weeks our notes were taken down by ear, without much idea of what they meant, in the faith that some day we should look them over and find that practical experience had made them comprehensible.

Whatever Miss Plummer's faith, it seems doubtful if her notes were ever of great value to her, for her notes as reproduced in the volume, *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889*, are incoherent, inadequate, and if a fair record of "by ear," graphic evidence of superficial coverage of subject matter.<sup>18</sup> Notes taken by May Seymour and included in the volume are better organized but not more thorough.<sup>19</sup>

There is little similarity between Dewey's summary of the first curriculum and that of Miss Plummer, which unadorned indicated that the School emphasized the following:

1. Attainment of the library hand.
2. Accession-book.
3. Writing of catalogue cards: biographies, analyticals, serials, etc.
4. Classification.
5. Filling up odd moments: cyclostyling, Hammond typewriter; reference work.
6. Lecture courses and their medley of topics.
7. Apprenticeship training: need of a little "relearning"; special class in German.<sup>20</sup>

In conclusion, Miss Plummer complimented Melvil Dewey by observing that "if the class be called a success, it is greatly owing to the ability and the generous spirit with which it was managed."<sup>21</sup>

Final reference to the School at the conference. The final reference to the School of Library Economy was that made by Judge Mellen Chamberlain, who, as chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, offered the following approving resolution:

*Resolved*, That this Association has observed with pleasure and gratification the first year's working of the School of Library Economy at Columbia College, and it regards the work there initiated as of great promise for the future.<sup>22</sup>

On this occasion, Chamberlain did not offer a minority report, as he had done at the Buffalo Conference of 1883. The resolution was passed unanimously, without conflict.

Rebuttal by Dewey. Dewey apparently listened in silence to the reports presented by the Committee on the School of Library Economy, the Committee on Resolutions, and possibly also to Miss Plummer's summation, but he made a tart reply through *Library Notes*, in which he first reproduced the reports,<sup>23</sup> and then commented:

Obviously with only a four-month course "to save time," with 35 outside lecturers "to guard against provincialism," and with the fair presentation of the various library systems of repute "to secure breadth," it was a poor soil and poorer season for the cultivation of repose.<sup>24</sup>

.....  
It is doubtful, however, if this School ever acquires a wide reputation for cultivating repose.<sup>25</sup>

.....  
We classify our Library School under dynamics, not statics.<sup>26</sup>

To what extent Dewey accepted the suggestions, however, will be noted in the following section, relating to the second year's program.

### The second class

Both Dewey and President Barnard assumed that the School would continue into a second year; in fact, Dewey announced even before the official termination of the first class that "nearly all the class that do not go at once to positions have decided to stay and complete the two years' course,"<sup>27</sup> and he remarked that:

It is specially satisfactory to the faculty of the School that their experience has led to this decision to do more thorough work than is possible in so short a time.<sup>28</sup>

Barnard, in his report to the Trustees, presented on May 2, 1887, praised the experiment as an "undoubted success," and offered the following recommendations for favorable consideration:

1. That convenient class and lecture rooms be set apart for the accommodation of the classes.
2. That a form of diploma or certificate of proficiency, bearing the seal of the college and the signature of the president, be devised to be given to those students in this school who complete satisfactorily a definitely prescribed course of study, and fulfil such other conditions as may be imposed on them to that end.<sup>29</sup>

The School did continue into a second year, beginning on November 10, 1887, with a group of senior students and a group of junior students. The senior group was composed of nine members of the twenty in the pioneer class who had decided to continue with the program as outlined by Dewey. They were two of the three men: George Watson Cole and Francis Chauncey Patten; and seven of the seventeen women: Lilian Howe Chapman, Lilian Denio, Harriet Converse Fernald, Harriet Sherman Griswold, Annie Brown Jackson, Eulora Miller, and Mary Wright Plummer. To the senior group were admitted Lydia Boker Godfrey and Ada Alice Jones.<sup>30</sup>

The twenty-two students who finally registered for the junior class<sup>31</sup> were better prepared for admission if they followed Dewey's advice, for he had published in *Library Notes* suggestions for those awaiting the opening of the preparatory term. Though he did advise, "We prefer to have the preceding summer largely devoted to laying in an extra stock of strength and good health [*sic*] for the activ [*sic*] work,"<sup>32</sup> he suggested: (1) improving skill in the use of library handwriting;<sup>33</sup> (2) the visiting of libraries; (3) a reading program, for which he recommended *Library Notes*, the *Library Journal*, and the U.S. Bureau of Education *Report on Public Libraries*;<sup>34</sup> (4) a broadening of one's general education, particularly in the study of languages such as German, French, and Latin.<sup>35</sup>

Dewey made no reference to educational qualifications, but by March, 1888, he announced, concerning the college degree as a prerequisite:

The line has not been strictly drawn, but all signs point towards a college degree for admission or at least the equivalent of the first three years of a college course.<sup>36</sup>

*Plans for the second class*

Plans for the second class indicated a progressive refinement of the pioneer program. Dewey announced that, since the first experiment had stimulated the need for a more thorough preparation, "the second year shows a long stride toward a professional school with as full a two years' course as is given in the law and medical schools." The plan, as outlined, offered: (1) a preparatory term of eight weeks, before the formal lecture term, for those without library experience; (2) a junior year; (3) a senior year; (4) a proposed third year of advanced work for those interested.

To the curriculum were added three subjects: (1) the bibliographical lectures initiated into the curriculum during the first year; (2) a course on the "great literatures of the world treated from the librarian's standpoint"; (3) a short course "on the leading languages as the librarian's tools." The broadened scope of the curriculum reflected Dewey's own analysis that "it was thought best to begin with only the technical part and wait till the demand of the public justified broadening the scope." He felt also that the enlarged curriculum justified changing the name of the program from "Library Economy" to "Library Science," of which economy was one aspect.<sup>37</sup>

With the expanded curriculum and an increased student body, Dewey added new members to the faculty, two of whom—Annie Brown Jackson and Mary Wright Plummer—had been enrolled in the pioneer class. The lecture program continued as in the first class, with twenty-three persons giving one or more lectures throughout the term.<sup>38</sup>

*Criticism of the second class*

Since no formal report was presented at the Catskill Conference of September, 1888, no information was forthcoming as to whether Dewey had profited from the suggestions made by the Committee of 1887, particularly that one relating to the pressure under which the students worked. It appears likely that he had not been particularly successful, for an editorial in the *Library Journal*, which appeared during the month of the Conference, warned of the dangers of the continuing high pressure.<sup>39</sup>

Dewey himself reported favorably on the student body through the pages of the *Library Journal*, wherein he praised the senior group for remaining, all but one, throughout the full year rather than departing at the end of the lecture term. He noted the marked improvement both in the lectures and in the instruction and predicted optimistically "another advance for the third year."<sup>40</sup> In a second report, issued in 1888, he depicted an all-encompassing program of training which he had envisioned for the School of Library Economy, of which the course of study, as represented by the work of the second class, was to be only a part.

Dewey's plan for broadening the program, 1888

Even while absorbed with the daily programming of the School and with the administrative harassments which were to lead to the transfer of the School to the New York State Library, Dewey projected a broad

plan whereby "all classes who seek help in fitting themselves for a larger and better work in the new profession of librarianship" might have an opportunity to receive some form of training. For each, according to his needs or his opportunities, Dewey outlined seven methods of securing training, beginning with the "simplest and cheapest and least satisfactory," which was identified as the "correspondence library school," and concluding with the "post-graduate course." The seven methods were: (1) correspondence library school; (2) summer library school; (3) private instruction; (4) instruction for special students or partial students; (5) junior courses; (6) senior or graduating courses; (7) post-graduate course.<sup>41</sup>

Four of the methods were, at the time the summary was written, being employed at the School of Library Economy. The second-year curriculum had been enlarged to include a junior and a senior program of instruction; the planning of a private program of instruction was a matter between the student and the instructor available for tutoring; and special students were being admitted to the program. The latter were being prudently warned that

A special (unless transfered to the regular class) is not graduated nor recommended for positions for which graduates are available, unless he has decidedly superior qualifications for some special place [*sic*].<sup>42</sup>

Three of the methods had not been employed; nor was the entire plan to be implemented fully during Dewey's association with the School. But because he had structured a complete program of training, it seems appropriate to record his concepts, later to be fostered by others, on: (1) correspondence library school; (2) summer school; (3) postgraduate course.

### *Correspondence library school*

The method in which Dewey expressed much interest was that of the correspondence school or course, and he announced with his usual anticipatory zeal that the Columbia College School expected to offer its first course by correspondence from October through December, 1889.<sup>43</sup> He informed the readers of *Library Notes* that correspondence work had been considered because of the many requests received at the School both from poorly prepared librarians seeking help and from prominent librarians seeking escape from the pressures of similar personal inquiries.

Unlike the admission requirements for the regular school, admission was to be open to those filling in the required blanks and who appeared to understand the purpose of the program. Prospective students were warned further that

Any one who completes a regular course of such study and passes satisfactory written examinations will be entitled of course to the certificate of graduation from the correspondence course but no one will for a moment look on that as equivalent to regular school graduation [*sic*].

Dewey was apparently ignoring the signs of imminent personal disaster which were to lead to his resignation on January 7, 1889, and to the crippling of his plans, for not only did he announce that a specific date had been chosen for the expected offering of the first correspondence course in cataloging and classification, he also announced that the future issues of *Library Notes* would include matters of interest to teachers of correspondence courses and that the correspondence students would be expected to have the *Notes* for reference.<sup>44</sup> The announcements were premature, and, in retrospect, Dewey's persistence in developing an ever expanding program of library training seems totally unrealistic and impractical, since he was aware of the opposition of the Trustees. According to his own annual report of 1887-88, he acknowledged that the School had been begun and continued "without any appropriation whatever from the trustees."<sup>45</sup>

Plans for the correspondence course were never implemented at Columbia College, for by the date appointed for the first instruction, the School was no longer functioning as the Columbia College School of Library Economy but as the New York State Library School. A general lack of interest in the idea permeated the profession and possibly served as a deterrent, for had Dewey not read extracts from *Library Notes* concerning the instruction, the subject would have been ignored at the Catskill Conference of 1888. The only comment recorded in the proceedings of that Conference was that made by J. N. Larned, librarian, Buffalo Library, Buffalo, New York, who remarked, "I think this scheme would be a great relief to many librarians in providing a place where questions could be answered."<sup>46</sup>

Had Dewey been able to develop a program of correspondence instruction in 1889, it is possible that Williamson's condemnation of the profession's failure to employ that method could not have been made. In his study of 1923 he concluded, without any acknowledgment of the pioneer effort of Dewey, that

Nothing better illustrates the general backwardness in the development of library service and technical training for it than the almost complete failure to make use of the correspondence method of instruction.<sup>47</sup>

Dewey had attempted to make use of the method, and the plan had failed, not because it was ineffectual, but because internal problems at Columbia College and his resignation made it impossible for him to perfect the plan. Dewey might have regarded the proposal as premature, moreover, for he did not attempt to offer a similar program at the New York State Library School.

### *Summer library school*

A program for summer work was planned by Dewey as another alternative for acquiring some training, and as was his custom, he outlined his plan and asked for a statement of preferences and additional suggestions.<sup>48</sup> He emphasized that the program was being offered for those



who were able to secure summer leaves of absence and that, when possible, attendance at the regular sessions of the School was more desirable.

Dewey made the following alternative suggestions in regard to summer instruction: (1) that the summer term be not less than one month or more than three months, or probably the usual six weeks of summer school, between July 1 and October 1; (2) that the school be in New York, or, if that was undesirable, that it be combined with a "summer school like Chautauqua, Amherst, Burlington, etc.," or that the group could meet in a "bit of pure country, mountains or seashore," or that it be established as a peripatetic school; (3) that admission policy admit all of "unexceptionabl character and reasonabl ability [*sic*]," or from among that group, the most promising candidates.

In discussing the "character of the course," Dewey seemed much concerned over the inspiration to be gained by the students that "cums from contact with earnest men and women full of the subject [*sic*]." The scope of the course as envisioned by Dewey would be a "summary of library management systematically discust [*sic*]."

Dewey's hortatory remarks, however, overemphasized the virtues of having the "spirit," against which none would object, by asserting:

And after all, the *spirit* is vastly more important than technical information, for one full of zeal and high ideals will find a way to lern the technique; but the most skilful master of routine and bibliographical detail has litl in his knowledge to beget that almost divine inspiration, without which the best educational and filanthopic [*sic*] work is seldom done.<sup>49</sup>

Dewey made no definite proposal for offering a summer session; he simply referred to the offering of summer work "as soon as the time for a library summer school is fully cum." The time did not "fully cum" while the School was located at Columbia College, nor, as events developed, was Dewey to be the first to offer a summer program.

Dewey was the first, however, to discuss the proposed summer program at the meeting of the American Library Association at which he had discussed the correspondence course. Again the only remark recorded in the proceedings was that made by Larned. His response, stimulated somewhat by local pride, should have pleased Dewey, for Larned agreed that Buffalo would be a delightfully cool spot for a summer session and volunteered to provide a room for the summer program and to give the free use of the Buffalo library.<sup>50</sup> The proceedings have no record of Dewey's acknowledgment of Larned's generous offer, nor were further comments made on the subject of summer-training programs either by Dewey or by Larned during the Conference.

### *Postgraduate course*

Concerning the postgraduate course, or work beyond the second year in the Columbia School program, Dewey announced that the School had found that

A respectabl [*sic*] minority of its graduates wish to carry their studies further, and is developing a course of higher work under constant and careful supervision, with such instruction as may be needed.<sup>51</sup>

Though the program was planned for graduates only, Dewey offered to extend it, should the demand warrant, to include those who wanted to obtain the degree by coming up for examinations or by a combination of correspondence courses and examinations. He evaluated the course as being worthy of the "master's degree, if degrees were conferrd," but, as of 1887, neither diplomas nor degrees were being awarded. At the time of the transference of the School to the New York State Library, plans for the advanced program had not been formulated in spite of Dewey's desire to offer a third year of training. Neither the program at the New York State Library School nor those in the imitative programs which were to be developed in the ensuing years attained the status of a post-graduate course. As late as 1923, Williamson implied that no such school existed, for he stated:

Elaborate plans have been proposed for a post-graduate library school with a full corps of well-paid instructors and an expensive physical equipment.<sup>52</sup>

Williamson, unlike Dewey earlier, made no attempt to foster such a program, but instead added, "Eventually it may be desirable to develop a school of this character."

In 1888, however, while Dewey was envisioning a broadened program for all classes of librarians, the Board of Trustees of Columbia College was contemplating the abolishment of the tangible aspects of that same program—the School of Library Economy.

#### TRANSFER OF THE SCHOOL TO ALBANY, 1889

Though Dewey had made no public acknowledgment of the imminent disaster confronting the School, the year 1888 brought to a climax the administrative conflicts between the Trustees of Columbia College and Dewey. The aspects which affected the School were Dewey's removal as director of the School and, more significantly, the transference of the School to the New York State Library. The School was not to be immobilized by the transfer; rather its future was possibly assured, for the Trustees had shown an increasing determination to abolish it.

At their meeting on November 15, 1888, the Trustees not only discussed the possible peremptory dismissal of Dewey, but they also approved a resolution which was to consider two problems: (1) was the School of Library Economy a desirable adjunct to the library; (2) if so, should the instruction not be committed to others than to the librarian of the college, that is, than to Dewey.<sup>53</sup> The resolution was referred to the Committee on Course and Statutes, which reported that it too doubted the expediency of continuing the School but, recognizing an obligation to

the students who were enrolled, was of the opinion that "the School should be continued during the current academic year." Ominously for Dewey, the Committee approved its continuation "under the immediate supervision and direction of the acting President."<sup>54</sup>

### Achieving the transfer

Since, by the decision of the Committee on Course and Statutes, Dewey was deprived of the directorship of the School and since he might not have been unaware of the threat of dismissal, it is not surprising to find him accepting another position and making every effort to have the School transferred to the New York State Library, of which he was made director as well as secretary of the University of the State of New York on December 12, 1888.<sup>55</sup>

At the first meeting of the Regents of the University after his arrival, Dewey brought to their attention the matter of the Library School, and, spurred on by his enthusiasm and promises, the Regents agreed unanimously "to complete a scheme for conducting this library training as a permanent feature of the State Library." They emphasized in their resolutions, however, that the Director would employ as assistants those best fitted and "willing to give their services for a satisfactory time without other compensation than the instruction and supervision furnished by the library."<sup>56</sup> To what extent Dewey's offer to staff the library with the students who would work without pay might have motivated the decision of the Regents is debatable, but there is little doubt that Dewey, in his desire to accomplish the transfer, used the manpower potential in the proposed classes as a bargaining medium.

Dewey immediately transmitted to the Trustees of Columbia College the resolution of the Regents. Though the Minutes of the meeting of the Trustees of February 4, 1889, imply that Dewey had engaged in subterfuge, the Committee on Course and Statutes authorized the Acting President

to continue the School until the transfer can be accomplished, but no longer, and have directed him to inform all persons concerned that in any event the School will be finally *closed* at the end of the current academic year.<sup>57</sup> [*Italics mine.*]

The Columbia College School of Library Economy was closed, according to the Trustees' instructions, on March 31, 1889, for on that date "the current academic year" ended.

Had Dewey not been able to manipulate the transfer of the School, even through questionable strategy, the first attempt to offer formal training would have ended in failure, for the Trustees advanced no alternative to the transfer other than closing. Librarians were informed of the transfer through an editorial in the *Library Journal*, which criticized Columbia College for its readiness to abandon the School and which laid bare for the first time evidence of the friction between Dewey and the Trustees concerning the admission of women. Praising the work of the School, the *Journal* added:

Under whatever auspices the School may be carried on, we hope that it may be successfully continued, for with all the criticism that may be passed upon it, its work has certainly been valuable in training and equipping librarians to be much more serviceable to the community than they otherwise would have been.<sup>58</sup>

A similar concern for the continuation of the School was expressed in the New York *Mail and Express* of December 28, 1888, and may well have been a persuasive factor in influencing the Regents, for much was made, as the following indicates, of the possible loss of the School:

If the Library School is suffered to languish, not even the gain to the State in acquiring Mr. Dewey's services will compensate for the loss sustained here.<sup>59</sup>

#### Stabilizing the transfer

Nine days after the formal transfer had occurred, Dewey instituted an apprentice program and made plans for the fall program. By July 10, 1889, the Regents agreed that since the experiment with the School had proved successful, it seemed safe to make the training a "permanent feature of the State Library."<sup>60</sup> After a discussion of thirteen recommendations, one of which acknowledged a continuity of the Columbia College program and an identification of the new program as the "Library School," and another of which extended the school year to nine months, the Regents unanimously adopted a resolution that the Board

without committing itself to the details set forth in the report approves the general action of the director in the premises as well as the continuance of the same, provided no financial liability on the part of the State be incurred.<sup>61</sup>

The Regents then, just as the Trustees of Columbia College had done earlier, offered no financial support to the School and appeared to view the School as a source of free manpower which would aid in the operation of the New York State Library, for the Regents frankly stated:

With the great amount of cataloging and other work to be done in our great library, this apprenticeship help can be used here to much better advantage than at Columbia, where nevertheless the school proved a marked success without a dollar from the treasury for its support.<sup>62</sup>

Thus, three months after the date of the transference of the School to Albany,<sup>63</sup> its continuation was assured. Dewey had, at the time of the School's impending demise, compelled its transfer by the sheer weight of his determination to have the School continue.

## The New York State Library School to 1893

### THE NEW YORK STATE LIBRARY SCHOOL AND ITS RECEPTION

#### Internal changes

Though the Trustees of Columbia College had authorized the closing of the School of Library Economy, a claim for continuity between the Columbia School and the one established at the New York State Library appears justified for the following reasons: (1) the acceptance of the curriculum planned by Dewey and pursued, after his departure from Columbia, under the direction of W. S. Biscoe and Mary S. Cutler;<sup>1</sup> (2) the transfer of all the "illustrativ collections and other belongings" of the School to Albany on April 1, 1889;<sup>2</sup> (3) the immediate establishment of an apprentice term beginning April 9 for thirteen of the students who had completed the lecture course at Columbia; (4) the departure of Mary S. Cutler, Ada Alice Jones, Nina Elizabeth Browne, May Seymour, Florence Woodworth, W. S. Biscoe, and F. C. Patten, all from Columbia, to become Dewey's associates in the New York State Library; (5) Dewey's continuing directorship of the School.

Dewey had planned for such a continuation as he anticipated the favorable decision of the Regents, for he had assured the profession, before the vote of July 10, that

In all probability the system adopted will vary little from that worked out at Columbia except as experience there and much better facilities and conveniences at Albany make many minor improvements possible.<sup>3</sup>

Two changes made, however, were major, for each was to be an influential and, at times, a questionable factor in the development of the formal library training program. The two changes were: (1) requirement of an entrance examination and (2) awarding of degrees.

#### *Entrance examinations*

Though Dewey had not attempted to give entrance examinations at Columbia College, he readily initiated a program of such examinations

at the New York State Library School. This was done primarily because of his desire to have the School conform to the pattern pursued in the other schools of the New York State University. In clarifying the purpose of the examinations Dewey stated:

The same idea is illustrated in our preliminary examinations of all law and medical students, in which the questions have nothing to do with law or medicine, but are solely to determine whether the candidates have sufficient general education to be allowed to go on with their technical studies.<sup>4</sup>

He emphasized at the same time that the examination would not be the sole factor considered, but that diplomas held and previous records of scholarship would be relevant criteria also.

Before the Regents had approved officially the status of the School, Dewey had effectuated the appointment of Mary S. Cutler as Library Examiner in April, 1899, and she had prepared by October 29 the first entrance examination for the School. The examination was essentially a factual test consisting of twenty-two questions,<sup>5</sup> of which the following are representative:

2. Mention one work of each of the following authors: John Ruskin, William H. Prescott, Charles Darwin, Thomas Carlyle, John Fiske, Hugh Miller, John Stuart Mill, Henry Drummond, Herbert Spencer, Henry M. Stanley.

.....  
9. Name 15 leading American daily newspapers.

.....  
13. Give 5 important dates in the history of the world, with events that they mark.

Only one question related specifically to librarianship, that one being:

19. What is your conception of the scope and purpose of a free public library?

Have you read articles in *Library Journal* and *Library Notes* recommended in the letter of acceptance?

Thirteen candidates sat for the historical entrance examination and presumably made a satisfactory showing, for in the first report of the fall term program, there was no reference to a failure.<sup>6</sup> The requirement of an entrance examination, as well as the difficulty of the questions, was soon to create considerable comment among the librarians who served as members of the A.L.A. Committee charged with the responsibility of reporting on the School. A solution to the problem had not been found even at the time of the Williamson study, for he was to report in 1923 that

Admission to all the schools, except the New York State and the University of Illinois, is by examination, altho applicants having degrees from approved colleges are accepted without examination in practically all others, with the reservation by some that the

college course must have included a broad training and modern languages.<sup>7</sup>

Williamson was to be critical of the examinations which had been abandoned, long before 1923, by the School which had initiated them.

### *Awarding of degrees*

Though Dewey had been unable during his tenure at Columbia College to fulfill the promise made in the "Circular of Information, 1886-87, that each student would receive a certificate,"<sup>8</sup> he had by 1887 outlined in the proposed changes for the second year a plan whereby college graduates, completing the two years' course, should receive the B.L.S. (Bachelor of Library Science) degree, and those completing the three years' course should receive the M.L.S. (Master of Library Science) degree. The Trustees, either through negligence or as a deliberate rebuff, continued to ignore the contents of the "Circular" as well as Dewey's confident statement that in the second year "only diplomas or certificates of proficiency"<sup>9</sup> were to be offered, for it was not until March 20, 1891, long after Dewey's withdrawal from Columbia College, that some of the students, through a petition, received a statement that they had attended the School of Library Economy.<sup>10</sup>

Dewey persevered in his efforts to formulate a sequence of degrees and presented, among his thirteen recommendations, to the Regents of the New York State University a plan similar to that which he had advocated while at Columbia College. In addition to the B.L.S. and the M.L.S. degrees, he added another, "*causa honoris*, D.L.S. [Doctor of Library Science] degree." His efforts were rewarded when on July 8, 1891, at the first public commencement of the School, degrees and diplomas were awarded to the students by George William Curtis, chancellor of the University of the State of New York.<sup>11</sup>

By 1891, not only had Dewey almost singlehandedly assured the continuity of the formal training program which he had instituted, but he had also added prestige and stature to that program by requiring an entrance examination and by convincing the Regents of the desirability of granting degrees for the training. All this he had accomplished with minimal support from the American Library Association.

### Reaction of the American Library Association

During the period of the possible dissolution of the School, no official statement was issued by the American Library Association or by the Committee on the School, possibly because the transfer occurred after the Catskill Conference of September, 1888, and before the St. Louis Conference, which met in May, 1889, about one month after the transfer had been made. However, at the St. Louis Conference, C. A. Cutter, one of the committee members, made no special reference to the transfer but instead limited his remarks to his visit which had been made to the School after Dewey's departure.<sup>12</sup> In contrast, both Foster and Green, also committee members, referred to the transfer of the

School and suggested that some assurance of the interest of the Association be made to the Regents and for the encouragement of the secretary, that is, Melvil Dewey. Green further moved "that the Executive Board of the A.L.A. add to its standing committees one of three or more on the library school."

The Association approved both of Green's proposals—that the Regents be informed of the Association's appreciation for the continuation of the School of Library Economy and that a committee of three be appointed "to inquire in what way they can be of service in promoting the objects for which the school is conducted, and to render such service to the extent of their power."<sup>13</sup> Before the end of the Conference, however, it became apparent that Winsor and Poole were not satisfied with the resolution, and they registered indirect opposition to the phrase, "promoting the objects for which the school is conducted," by offering two variant resolutions. Green offered as his defense that it seemed proper that the "association should declare its opinion in regard to the value of its methods and teaching" and further that "gratitude, also, should lead us to express our appreciation of the work if it is good."

Though the resolution relating to the School was not rescinded, it was apparent at the end of the Conference that its unanimous approval was of token value and that it did not reflect the continuing opposition expressed by two powerful leaders in the Association. In contrast, the Standing Committee of Three owed its existence to the sustained interest in the formal training program of S. S. Green, who, at the 1883 Conference, had supported Dewey's appeal to the Association.

#### *Standing Committee of Three, 1890-91*

Though it can only be assumed that the reports were accepted but not endorsed as the official opinion of the Association, the reports of the Standing Committee of 1890 and 1891 welcomed the continuation of the formal training program on the basis that both librarians and trustees had benefited from the establishment of the School, and expressed confidence that the School would increase in usefulness.<sup>14</sup>

The reports, while laudatory and complimentary of the efforts of Dewey, conveyed to the Association the concept that college graduates were being preferred, but neither the membership nor the committee members questioned the wisdom of the requirement. In contrast, the atmosphere of the School and the requirement of an entrance examination received increasing attention.

The atmosphere. Criticism of the feverish, unrestful atmosphere continued to be made; in reply, Dewey implied that the financial encumbrances of the students contributed to their attempting to encompass in one year the work of four and, secondly, he added that he doubted if he were "well calculated to repress their enthusiasm."<sup>15</sup>

The entrance examination. Though Caroline M. Hewins, a committee member of 1890, had acknowledged the difficulty of framing examinations, she had tentatively approved the idea on the basis that a person who could answer the questions satisfactorily would be more useful than



one who had read only third-rate novels.<sup>16</sup> In the following year, Frank P. Hill expressed concern over the examinations, noting that from October, 1889, through June, 1891, thirty-five persons out of sixty-one had failed in one or more studies.<sup>17</sup> He questioned the severity of the examinations and, while admitting that perhaps they were not too difficult to "secure the best material," suggested that "just as good results might be obtained with a little lower standard."<sup>18</sup> In support of the lowering of standards, Hill offered his observation that "it isn't always the best educated person who makes the best librarian," but that equally important was knowing how to meet and to treat people who visited the library.

Critical comments of Richardson. The most critical comments were made by Richardson, to whom the task, to discuss the School as it should be, was assigned. As Dewey had done in 1887,<sup>19</sup> Richardson expressed regret that the School was teaching library economy only, rather than library science.<sup>20</sup> He viewed the course, nevertheless, as a marked improvement over the past years, citing as desirable the reduction of hours devoted to mechanical detail and the increase of those devoted to bibliography.

Richardson cited the following as some of the imperfections: (1) the failure to formalize the lecture series in order to give soberness and force in the conduct of the School; (2) the subordination of bibliographic instruction and overemphasis on such aspects as the library hand, the printing hand, and, for example, fountain pens; (3) the instruction being subject to the "criticism of teaching method without science, praxis before principle"; (4) the need to broaden the curriculum to include perhaps instruction in the handling of manuscripts.<sup>21</sup>

Suggestions for improvement. Richardson proposed for the immediate betterment of the School three things: (1) reducing the hours of recitation or the number of extra and irregular hours; (2) developing a systematic curriculum wherein the hours were apportioned according to the importance of the subject; (3) publishing a calendar giving specific information on instruction and apparatus.<sup>22</sup> Richardson failed, however, to comment on a recommendation made by Miss Hewins in 1890 that, as a preparatory requirement, some volunteer work in a library be required and that the students, between their junior and senior years, complete "a year's work in as many departments as possible of a large library." It was not an original proposal even in 1890, however, for Dewey had advocated a similar plan for an intervening practical experience in the program which he had outlined in the "Circular of Information, 1886-87."

Though such a procedure was never perfected, both Dewey and Miss Hewins had anticipated a proposal to be made by Williamson in 1923 that, before one pursued the second year's program, "at least one year of first-class library experience should be required."<sup>23</sup>

CRITICISMS  
OF TRAININGDisinterest of Andrew Carnegie

After Andrew Carnegie had proclaimed publicly in 1890 that he would direct his philanthropic efforts toward the building of free libraries in communities willing to maintain and develop them,<sup>24</sup> Dewey sought financial aid from him to insure the future of the School. Encouraged by the pronouncement, Dewey informed Carnegie by letter and by visit of the plight of the Library School and, on May 12, 1890, wrote:

I have for many years struggled with my limited means to do what I could for these pupils in the firm belief that some one would feel it a privilege to give us the means to secure needed help.<sup>25</sup>

Carnegie, in spite of his zeal to further the development of libraries, was not willing to assume a concomitant responsibility in contributing to the training of librarians, for after a visit from Dewey, he wrote on May 15, 1890:

Your interesting visit was the first I had ever heard of the school for librarians. I was interested in all you said, but you misunderstood me, if you thought I had made a positive promise to contribute funds. This is matter which requires much consideration. I have taken occasion to inquire of several parties about the supply of proper persons for libraries, and find that *there is no difficulty in getting persons naturally adapted for this work*. We employed one for the Braddock's Library who gives entire satisfaction; and Allegheny has got one. In Baltimore, I was told, that it was really wonderful how many of their young assistants developed into splendid librarians. [*Italics mine.*]<sup>26</sup>

Thus unceremoniously did Carnegie refuse to offer financial assistance to the New York State Library School, but Dewey, unwilling to accept the decision, wrote again informing Carnegie that his information had been secured from persons not well informed and that, even while he was writing the letter, "your librarian at Pittsburg was on his way to ask for just this help which you seem to think is not very important." As if making one final desperate effort to interest Carnegie in the Library School, Dewey concluded:

The man who wrote "Triumphant Democracy" cannot long be kept in ignorance of as great an educational movement as we have in hand & I feel absolute confidence that if your life is spared, we shall yet find you one of the warmest friends & supporters of the Library School & that you in turn will find it your most valuable ally in helping the public by means of libraries which are daily coming nearer to their real position as the colleges for the people.<sup>27</sup>

Though the appeal of 1890 was ineffectual, since Carnegie was not to allocate any funds to the New York State Library School during Dewey's

incumbency, Dewey's prediction that Carnegie would become a friend and supporter of educational programs for librarians was to be fulfilled in the twentieth century.

### Within the profession

Though the Standing Committee of Three had not, in 1890, included any reference to the work of the students after completion of the course, in 1891 the Committee report cited as one of the ten achievements of the School its success in keeping "librarians and their assistants on their mettle all the time."<sup>28</sup> The additional comments that the librarians did not want the School to get ahead of them and that one good Library School girl could "put more snap into a staff than any amount of scolding, flattery, or A.L.A. conference," implied an incipient rivalry which was to flourish until its supreme manifestation at the Portland Conference of 1905.

Before 1891 a warning had been issued by Harriet E. Green, an instructor at the Library School and a cataloger in the Boston Athenaeum, against expecting too much from new library school graduates. At the fifth session of the 1890 Conference, Miss Green offered a sane presentation of the problems which were to face the graduates who, too often because of shortages, were being placed in positions for which they were not prepared. In her speech, "Library Experts—Their Rights and Duties,"<sup>29</sup> she emphasized that the graduates were "just ready to begin the work of making themselves experts" and that they were not experts upon graduation. To attain the status of an expert, Miss Green warned the graduates that they would become prepared not by theories alone but by virtue of "actual, practical, varied experience and responsibility." Though Miss Green was the first to warn of the dangers arising from overestimating the abilities of the graduates, her view was sanctioned by Melvil Dewey at the Conference; within a few months, Mary Wright Plummer was to issue a similar warning through the pages of *Library Journal*.<sup>30</sup>

### *The first questionnaire on the value of training*

Not only did Miss Plummer support Miss Green's thesis, but she also stated that the School made no pretence of producing experts or of claiming perfection and that in reality "the instruction furnished by the School is but the beginning of wisdom." Miss Plummer viewed the matter with more objectivity as she attempted to explore the question whether the Library School with its systematized and concentrated training could produce the kind of help needed or whether it would create only a new set of machines. In pursuing the answer, Miss Plummer formulated what is probably the first questionnaire on the value of training.

At the time of the study, three classes had been graduated with an average of eighteen students per class or about fifty-four in the three-year period. In gathering her data, Miss Plummer sent questionnaires only to those employing graduates and to the graduates themselves. Though the returns were not creditable in number to the issue, the

questions to the trustees and employing librarians attempted to probe the quality of training. The prestige of formal training was enhanced when in answer to the first question eleven out of fifteen respondents expressed a preference for the Library School graduate, for the first question asked:

Would you prefer for an assistant (or librarian) a graduate of the Library School or a person of equal ability trained by yourself or in another library?<sup>31</sup>

To the question relating to defects in training attributable to the School, eight out of thirteen respondents were unable to cite defects whereas four mentioned inadequacies. While it is not known whether those four who cited defects were the same four who expressed a preference for apprenticeship training, it seems likely, for three of the four charged the students with lack of adaptability and the fourth, that the School was "more of books than of men."

Miss Plummer expressed particular concern over the charge of lack of adaptability, stating that it would be "the rock on which the reputation of the School will split," unfairly for the School, since nothing was being laid down as dogma, and she concluded that those who found bigotry among the students would find the School less rigid.

From the replies of the former students, it was learned that thirty-six out of forty had attended Library School without a promise of a position on condition of finishing the course; that nineteen out of twenty-nine obtained their positions because of having attended the School; that seventeen out of eighteen had no difficulty in adapting themselves to different systems; that thirty-four out of thirty-five did not regret the time spent in the School, whereas the thirty-fifth respondent replied that she had not enough experience to judge at the time the questionnaire arrived. Whatever the unevenness of the questionnaire and of the returns, it was evident that by 1891 graduates of the Library School were deriving benefits from their training which they were willing to attribute to that training.

In a more subjective manner, Miss Plummer reviewed some of the criticisms made by the respondents, offering at times her own explanation. For example, in reply to the criticism that "the teaching seems to be on the plane of the demands of a college library rather than the common-sense every day needs of an average public library," Miss Plummer agreed that since most of the graduates accepted positions in public libraries it was "without doubt a misfortune, viewed from the standpoint of present utility" that the School was connected with the scholar's library rather than one free to the public.

In clarifying her point of view that more emphasis should be placed on preparation for public library work, Miss Plummer proposed that the first year of formal training might be devoted to elementary work and to public library problems and all advanced work relegated to the second year. By this plan the student, having but a year at his disposal, would thus be prepared to accept a position in a public library without

missing any part of the instruction, whereas the student interested in college or reference work could consider the first year's program a basis for the second year.<sup>32</sup> Quite early, then, Miss Plummer was projecting the concept that a different *kind* of training was necessary for work in a public library as compared to work in a college or a reference library and that a one year's course could be planned and especially adapted to prepare one for work in a public library. The concept was not totally new, however, for Dewey had implied a distinction in his article, "Library Employment *vs.* the Library Profession," written in 1886, wherein he stated that library work was analogous to the work of the public school teacher and the college professor, but he did not offer two patterns of training.

### *Criticism of theoretical teaching*

Though the Committee of Three of 1892 commented favorably on the continuous improvement in the management of the School, the raising of standards, the awarding of degrees, and the inclusion of subjects such as practical bibliography, reading, and literary methods,<sup>33</sup> the Committee took the extraordinary step of giving special attention to the criticism which was being made by outsiders about the School. It was a criticism which implied that the students were not being prepared to meet the situations of the day and that the School had been engaged in "theoretical teaching rather than practical work." Though sources of the criticism were not revealed, both Miss Green and Miss Plummer had recognized earlier its emergence. Quite likely, in addition, the appearance of the questionnaire on the value of training focused attention on the respective merits of formal and apprenticeship training and made it necessary for the Committee to incorporate a comment in its formal report.

George E. Wire, a member of the Committee and a member of the Library School class of 1889, agreed with the critics that some practical work was necessary, but at the same time he approved the teaching method of the School by explaining that

To a certain extent theoretical teaching is the aim of the school, the idea being that, given a right theory, the proper accommodation to circumstances can easily be made.<sup>34</sup>

The major contribution of the report, consequently, was not the continuing element of praise, but the acknowledgment that the School was being sharply criticized for offering "theoretical" instruction. That such a charge could have been made within five years after the establishment of the first School of Library Economy indicated a degree of dissatisfaction with library school graduates and a misconception of the purpose of the School, the aim of which in establishment had been *entirely practical*. Further, it provided for those who had opposed, or who had not supported, from the beginning, the concept of formal training, continuing justification for their response. Among those was Justin Winsor, who, in 1892, five years after the opening of the School of

Library Economy, expressed himself on the subject in a letter to Charles W. Dabney, president of the University of Tennessee. Dabney, on behalf of a young man interested in library work, had inquired concerning personal qualification and instructions; to that inquiry Winsor replied:

A good general education and a reasonable facility in French, German and Latin, with habits of order and analyzing, a good handwriting—the present is not a model—and perceptive powers that easily embrace a subject, are the best qualities for one who wishes to advance in library work.

He appeared unenthusiastic about library school training and suggested that the gentleman might serve an apprenticeship in the Harvard Library, where “we should endeavor to let him have insight into all the departments of our work.”<sup>35</sup>

### *Criticism of a specific activity*

That the activities of the School were under critical surveillance was evidenced during preparations for the Columbian Exposition in 1893. At that time, when the Library School was preparing an exhibit of a model library and of appliances, there was prevalent the suspicion that the exhibit would serve as a propagandistic medium for the Library School doctrines. Such a concept was rejected by the *Library Journal*, which praised the exhibit as fair in presentation and further as a “testimony to the zeal, patience, industry and devotion of the scholars and officers” of the School.<sup>36</sup>

The Committee of 1893 concurred with the *Library Journal* and, while not acknowledging any criticism, reported that the success of the exhibit proved, as nothing else could, the wisdom shown by the Association

in *recommending* and *establishing* this, the first school in the world devoted to the instruction and training of young men and women for the library profession.<sup>37</sup> [*Italics mine.*]

Thus, ten years after the Buffalo Conference of 1883, when Dewey had experienced the utmost difficulty in extracting from the Association an expression of approval of his scheme for a Library School, the Association accepted, without correction, the implication of the 1893 report. The School had been clearly, throughout the years of its molding and precarious existence, Melvil Dewey's School, not that of the Association. The latter had fostered, however, through its Standing Committee of Three, a unique relationship which warranted special recognition during a period when variant types of training programs were emerging.

## Emergence of new training programs in the nineteenth century

Not only was the New York State Library School assured of its continuity during the 1890's, but there was to develop during the decade a complex of library training programs. Such a development was not an isolated phenomenon but a response, on varying levels, to the ever expanding policy of establishing libraries and the subsequent employment of the bibliothecally incompetent or the untrained. It was a policy, moreover, to become immeasurably accelerated by the donations of Andrew Carnegie for library buildings<sup>1</sup> without a commensurate provision for insuring the quality of library service. During the decade the number of public, society, and school libraries having 1,000 volumes and over increased from 3,503 in 1891 to 5,383 in 1900,<sup>2</sup> an increase of more than 80 per cent. The incompetent or untrained were being employed of necessity since as of 1900 only 377 graduates of all the training programs were actually employed in libraries.<sup>3</sup>

The training programs were not characterized by conformity of structure or of content, but seemed to appear where a Library School graduate labored or where a particularly strong personality presumed to establish a training program as he envisioned one to be. Not all the programs were equally successful, whatever the qualifications of their directors. The lack of success appears to be less attributable to the individuals associated with them than to the premature thrusting of the concept into environments not fully conscious of the need or value of training. Initial efforts were unsuccessful in the states of Iowa and Nebraska; the most noted failure, however, occurred in Maine and will be discussed later.

In Iowa, the Iowa Library Society proposed that a home study course, planned by Esther Crawford, a one-year graduate of the New York State Library School, be pursued in 1895. Though no record of participation was kept, the venture appeared less than successful when those who had agreed to review the course failed to attend the annual meeting.<sup>4</sup> In the same year, the program planned in Nebraska did not materialize. It was to have been held in Lincoln at the University and was announced as a course in "Libraries and Their Management." Publicized as part of the State Institute program, it was to be under the direction of Mary

Letitia Jones and Mary Esther Robbins, both graduates of the New York State Library School. The attempt failed, however, because too few librarians expressed an interest.<sup>5</sup>

#### SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS ESTABLISHED BY 1891

By the end of 1891, three programs had been developed which were imitative of the New York State Library School largely in that they were attempting to offer formalized training. Yet when the Standing Committee made its appraisal that the Library School would continue to increase in usefulness until it was recognized "as the most powerful agent in shaping successful library workers,"<sup>6</sup> it ignored the existence of two of the programs which were functioning as of the date of the report, and it did not anticipate the third. The three widely divergent programs were the Pratt Institute program, the Amherst Summer School, and the Los Angeles Public Library Training Class.

##### Pratt Institute

Pratt Institute, which was established in 1887, began its training program in the autumn of 1890 in response to appeals for instruction but, more particularly, to train assistants for the Pratt Library.<sup>7</sup> Though the plans had been made before the appointment of Mary Wright Plummer, it was she who assumed responsibility for the program and informed the Association about it at the San Francisco Conference. Miss Plummer emphasized that the classes had been organized for those persons unable to attend the New York State Library School and that persons who attended the course were informed that their brief training could not qualify them for positions equal to those held by graduates of the Library School.<sup>8</sup> From the beginning of the program, however, participants either held or accepted positions in other libraries to which they were recommended by Pratt Institute.

The original program consisted of two terms, each three months long; to that was added a third term, an apprenticeship, for those with the most satisfactory records. Neither certificates nor degrees were awarded for the completion of the course.

By 1892 the program had been extended to two six months' courses, one in cataloging and one in library economy; entrance examinations were being held;<sup>9</sup> and no statement was made comparing the quality of the program to that of the New York State Library School. Miss Plummer's recognition that the program needed strengthening was an apparent motivation in the reorganizational plans which led to the extension of the course to two years. In 1896 a second year was added, which was publicized as being not entirely "an extension of the first-year work but rather a development of another phase, the historical and bibliographical."<sup>10</sup> The purpose of the second year, stated as being to fit graduates for any branch of library work, implied a status approximating that of the New York State Library School.



### Amherst Summer School

In contrast to the Pratt Institute program, which was being directed by a graduate of the pioneer School, the Amherst Summer School was organized by William I. Fletcher, librarian, Amherst College, who, while not a graduate, had had some association with the School in the capacity of a lecturer.<sup>11</sup> The program appears to have been developed solely on the initiative of Fletcher, though Dewey had envisioned a similar program in 1888 and had suggested, with what proved to be some clairvoyance, Amherst as a possible location. Whether the idea was original with Fletcher or whether it was suggested, he was fulfilling one of Dewey's plans as outlined in March, 1888, in his "Summer School for Librarians."<sup>12</sup>

According to Fletcher, he had undertaken the program in response to a demand from several quarters, which he failed to identify,

for a brief course calculated to give beginners in library work, or the librarians of small libraries who have not been brought in contact with modern improved methods, enough instruction in such methods to answer their immediate demands.<sup>13</sup>

The first announcement of the Summer program was made in April, 1891, at which time those interested were informed that, during a five weeks' program, instruction in the form of practical lectures from Fletcher would be given for two hours daily and that the class would be conducted for beginners.<sup>14</sup> No admission requirements were specified nor was there any reference to the fact that the Summer School was planned for those who could not attend, for various reasons, the New York State Library School. Fletcher did imply later, just as Miss Plummer had done at the 1891 Conference, that his program was not regarded as equivalent to that of the New York State Library School. He reported that three of his eleven students had expressed a desire to attend the School at Albany because the brief course at Amherst had whetted their appetites for the thorough training of the Library School.<sup>15</sup>

Not only was the program strenuous for the students; it was equally a strenuous one for Fletcher, who was the sole instructor. His method of instruction consisted of reading aloud from Cutter's rules and commenting thereon, with references to Linderfelt's and Perkins' rules, and of practice work in cataloging, which he criticized daily. It was an apparently successful technique, for the Summer School, which from the beginning was so significantly a reflection of one man's personality, continued until 1905 under the direction of Fletcher.<sup>16</sup>

### Los Angeles Public Library Training Class

To what extent the publicity given the training programs at the San Francisco Conference of 1891 contributed to the development of a training class on the West Coast is not known, but it is known that the first actual reference in print is to be found in the *Bulletin* of the Los Angeles Public Library of November, 1891.<sup>17</sup> Practical reasons for the establishment were cited, the main one being that increases in circulation had diverted

the entire staff to public services thereby causing neglect of other functions. When the Training Class was proposed as a means of enlarging the staff while at the same time not diminishing the book budget, the Board of Trustees approved the plan. It also offered assurances that "henceforth all additions to the regular staff of employees would be made from the ranks of the training-class graduates."<sup>18</sup>

Gains, first to the library and second to the individual, motivated the establishment of the program. The specific gains identified were: (1) eighteen hours' service per day from the trainees; (2) systematic training offered at the expense of the individual, not the library; (3) ultimate availability of trainees for substitute and special duty; (4) raising the standards of qualification for library attendants.

The Training Class program<sup>19</sup> was unexpectedly somewhat similar to that of Pratt and, later, the other Institute programs, even though the two librarians, Tessa L. Kelso and Adelaide R. Hasse, associated with it, had not attended the Library School. The class, open only to women, had as its major entrance requirements: (1) completion of high school or evidence of having attained an education equivalent to that of a high school; (2) passing of an entrance examination; (3) an acceptance of an obligation to work three hours daily in the library for a period of six months. Though the Institutes did not emphasize the obligation, practical work was a rigid requirement; therefore, as did the Los Angeles Public Library, the Institute libraries profited from the curricula requirements which they had formulated.

The course of study was similar also in that one year could be spent in pursuing the systematic program, carefully detailed so as to include in its first course accession; binding and mailing; classification and some cataloging; reference, loan, and shelf work. In the second course practical cataloging and a study of library reports, statistics, professional periodicals, and California state laws governing libraries offered realistic and theoretical training.

Three years after its organization, the Los Angeles Public Library Training Class was equated with the programs of the other schools by the Committee on Library School and Training Classes in 1894. The appraisal of the Committee was that

The systematic curriculum, the number of those who have completed it, the character of the instruction as indicated by the examination papers, establish its right to be ranked as a school of library economy.<sup>20</sup>

### *Later history*

Under the management of Miss Kelso, director, and Miss Hasse, assistant librarian, the Training Class program approximated that of the Institutes and it seemed destined to fulfill the expectations of the 1894 Committee report when suddenly administrative changes occurred. Both Miss Kelso and Miss Hasse resigned on May 1, 1895. Their departure left the Los Angeles Public Library shaken by the loss of its leaders

and not at all strengthened by the political appointment of a bookkeeper, with no library experience, as a librarian.<sup>21</sup>

Had Miss Kelso and Miss Hasse remained, it is likely that the Class would have become a dominant factor in the preparation of West Coast librarians, but by 1901 the Los Angeles Public Library announced that it could henceforth train only its own assistants. The Library emphasized, however, at the same time, that the "need for a training school for librarians on this coast is most evident from the number of applications we have for admission to this class."<sup>22</sup> The Training Class continued until 1914, at which time it was transformed into a one-year professional school. Thus it formed the nucleus of one of the fourteen programs examined by Williamson when he made his survey for the Carnegie Corporation.<sup>23</sup>

## PROLIFERATION OF PROGRAMS

### Training programs in Institutes or academic environments

#### *In Institutes*

In 1892 two Institutes, similar to Pratt, were established: Drexel Institute at Philadelphia and Armour Institute at Chicago. Each, like Pratt, was designed to emphasize the application of art and sciences to vocational or industrial pursuits and to give every student practical skill along one line of work. The ready inclusion of library training in the educational programs, while fulfilling the aims of the Institutes, fostered the concept of formalized training, for Armour was the first to announce that "the order of instruction is modelled upon that given at the New York State Library School in the first year."<sup>24</sup> The inclusion was a tribute both to the Library School and to Pratt Institute, for the librarians, like Miss Plummer, were graduates of the School. In the appointments of women both as librarians and as directors of the training programs, the Institutes were fostering a trend toward the feminization of the profession. It was a trend later to be deplored by Williamson as a factor contributing to the lack of prestige of library schools in the twentieth century;<sup>25</sup> as of the nineteenth century, however, the appointments merely reflected the feminization of the parent Library School.

Drexel Institute program, 1892. Plans for the program at Drexel Institute were well formulated when announced on October 20, 1892, by which date four variant training programs had been established. The circular outlining the program implied that the plans would be in accordance "with the standards which have been established in schools already in existence," but neither the schools nor the standards were cited.<sup>26</sup> Among the reasons advanced for offering the courses were: (1) an awareness that the rapid expansion of the public library movement had created a demand for skilled directors and assistants; (2) a recognition at Drexel of the need for systematic training in specially qualified schools as preparation for those positions; (3) Drexel's desire

to be among those special schools. It was a desire no doubt stimulated by the presence in the library of two graduates of the New York State Library School, Alice B. Kroeger and Bessie Macky, and by the support of President James MacAlister, who was to lecture on the history of books and printing.

The curriculum consisted of two courses, one in library economy and one in cataloging. In addition, lectures were to be given on English literature, bibliography, and the history of books and printing. The students were required, however, to devote a certain portion of each day to practical work in the library of the Institute. Requirements for admission were stated as being "a good English education, equivalent to the diploma of a high school or college of good standing," and the passing of an examination designed to test the general education of applicants. The awarding of certificates<sup>27</sup> added prestige to the Drexel program, which, from the first, was more deliberately imitative of that of the pioneer School than was the program at Pratt Institute.

Armour Institute program, 1893. Like the two other Institutes after which it was being patterned,<sup>28</sup> Armour Institute, with a Library School graduate, Katharine Lucinda Sharp, as its librarian, planned to offer training in library work. In consequence, a Department of Library Science was established at the insistence of the President, Dr. F. W. Gunsaulus, who, according to Miss Sharp, proposed that the Institute library should be a laboratory for the training of assistants. The course, for which an entrance examination was a prerequisite for admission, offered one year's instruction in three terms, the first of which was scheduled for September 12, 1893.<sup>29</sup> Unlike the courses at the other Institutes, the Armour course was so planned that the one-year program could be supplemented by a second year of advanced work. The latter included the history of printing, the history of libraries, continental literature, bibliography courses to be taught by specialists from the University of Chicago, library architecture, and practice work in the library. Few, if any, however, remained to complete the two-year course because of the demand for trained help in libraries.<sup>30</sup>

Because of the implication that the library should be a laboratory, much emphasis was placed on practical work. Each member of the class learned the routines by acting as an assistant to each member of the staff two weeks at a time and later served a specified number of apprentice hours. Opportunities for outside work were available, such as assisting with the indexing of scientific periodicals for *Electrical Literature* or organizing school or Sunday School libraries. Among the distinctive features was the emphasis on children's work and the provision of an opportunity for practical experience in that field.<sup>31</sup>

While in the beginning it was regarded as fortunate that the course was associated with a technical school, it became evident as it expanded that the Armour Institute could not meet the demands of the program because of limited quarters and equipment. Consequently, when in 1897 the University of Illinois offered to "adopt the department, its students, and its technical equipment and to make it the State Library School,"

the offer was accepted. With the formal transfer, achieved with the good will of Armour Institute, a new era for one of the three original institute programs began. Miss Sharp, who became both librarian of the University and director of the School, referred to the transfer as an adoption "advantageous in every way" and noted particularly the advantages of the tuition, beautiful classrooms, the "generous appropriation for new books, so that the classes will not lack practical work," and the admission requirement of two years of college work.<sup>32</sup>

With its integration into the University program, the degree of B.L.S. (Bachelor of Library Science) was to be conferred on those completing the entire course, which consisted of four years of University study.<sup>33</sup> The last two years were to be devoted to library work; the first two, to the usual college course. By its transfer, by raising the admission requirement to two years of college work, and by granting the degree of B.L.S., the Illinois School was more nearly similar to the New York State Library School than were the other Institute programs. The raising of entrance requirements to two years of college further separated the School from Pratt and Drexel, which continued to accept high school graduates or those with equivalent training. Not the least aware of the successful establishment of a Midwest Library School was Melvil Dewey, who, when speaking at the dedication of the new building, spoke of the "bright prospects for the new Illinois State Library School."<sup>34</sup>

Stability of the Institute programs. Though each of the programs had been developed independently, similarities emerged which were attributable to the common educational experiences of the directors and which revealed the influence of the Library School. That the Institutes had developed programs comparable to that of the Library School was the conclusion of the Committee on Library School and Training Classes. It reported in 1896, before the transfer of Armour to the University of Illinois, that it found the four programs differing little as to the amount of time spent on subjects but that there were variations as to emphases on incidentals of the actual work.<sup>35</sup> The subjects examined were those which from the beginning had been the nucleus of each program: cataloging, classification, accession work, loan systems, shelf department work, bibliography, and reference. All the programs were praised for including

a practical study of library work under different systems and circumstances, by the visitation and examination of various leading libraries, and the subsequent discussion of their several methods.

It is a tribute to the directors of the programs that when Williamson made his study not only was the New York State Library School among those examined but also two of the Institute programs, that of Pratt and the University of Illinois Library School, formerly the Armour Institute Library School.<sup>36</sup> The third program, that of Drexel Institute, had been discontinued in 1914, but it had been revived by the time of the publication of the Williamson report.<sup>37</sup>

*In academic environments*

A variety of highly individualized programs flourished in academic institutions in the 1890's. Two programs similar to the courses offered in the Institutes were those at the Maine State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts and at Columbian University in Washington, D.C. Differing programs were organized at Syracuse University and at the University of Chicago. Of these four only one, that at Syracuse, was to survive for inclusion in the Williamson study.

In Maine: Maine State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. The training program established at the Maine State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts was under the direction of Harriet Converse Fernald, a member of the first class of Columbia College School of Library Economy. It was publicized in the 1894 annual report of the College, which included a circular, probably written by Miss Fernald, quoting Dewey on the attractions of librarianship for women.<sup>38</sup> The publicity emphasized that the Maine school was the only New England school offering a year's course in library economy and that the course would be attended by students who had completed high school or who had training equivalent to that of a high school. Only the latter group was required to pass an entrance examination. Certificates were to be awarded.

The course was described as being thoroughly practical and it was expected that its graduates would be fitted to assume direction of small libraries or of departments of large libraries.<sup>39</sup> In spite, however, of the favorable environment, free tuition, and a generous welcome extended by the *Library Journal*,<sup>40</sup> the program was discontinued because of an administrative decision, made in 1896, that too few "students could be served in this course even if an additional instructor were employed."<sup>41</sup> Thus another program failed, not because its contents had not been carefully outlined, but because of the lack of response in Maine. A contributing factor might have been that in 1893 the state of Maine had only fourteen free libraries with a collection of 93,000 volumes<sup>42</sup> and that, in spite of Miss Fernald's initial enthusiasm, library service had not reached a level of development which would have created an interest in a formal training program.

In Washington, D.C.: Columbian University. In 1897, after the Armour Institute school had been transferred to the University of Illinois, a program was established in Washington, D.C., somewhat similar in that it was part of a university program and was offering a degree for a four-year course. Columbian University instituted as one of its regular four-year courses of the Corcoran Scientific School of the University a course in library work designed especially to meet the training needs of the city. Provisions were also made so that students could receive certificates of proficiency after completing the purely technical part of the course in two years.<sup>43</sup>

The school differed from the others in that special instruction was offered in the evening and that the faculty consisted largely of librarians of government agencies. The first faculty consisted of Ainsworth R.

Spofford, for thirty-five years Librarian of Congress, who, in June, 1897, was made first assistant upon the appointment of John Russell Young as librarian; William Parker Cutter, librarian, Department of Agriculture; and Henderson Presnell, librarian, Bureau of Education. In addition, Henry Carrington Bolton, chemist and distinguished bibliographer of scientific literature, was appointed to the faculty. As compared to the faculties of the other library schools, the Columbian faculty excelled in scientific preparation and long bibliographical and practical experience.

The program survived the nineteenth century and it appeared for a while that it would be considerably enlarged when, in 1904, it was announced that the University contemplated establishing a department of graduate study in bibliography and library science.<sup>44</sup> Though plans were being made for enlarging the program, the school was discontinued mainly because of the departure from Washington of Cutter, director of the program. The major reason given for the abandonment of the school was the "difficulty experienced in securing the proper faculty for carrying on the work."<sup>45</sup>

In New York: Syracuse University. Whereas the program at the Amherst Summer School reflected the initiative of William I. Fletcher, the program at Syracuse University seems to have reflected the impact of Henry Orrin Sibley, the librarian, on the Trustees of the University, who, in 1891, gave to Sibley the rank of instructor. One year later, almost simultaneously with his receiving the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University, Sibley was designated "Instructor of Library Economics with instructorship relations to the Liberal Arts faculty."<sup>46</sup> The first evidence of that relationship appeared in the *Annual* of the University for 1893-94, which announced the following course:

#### *Library Economics*

Opportunity will be given to such as desire it to take a course of instruction with the Librarian in Library Economics. The course will embrace (1) Library writing and appliances, (2) Books, size, form, binding, etc., (3) Study and practice in accessioning, indexing and cataloguing, (4) Record books—filing and indexing Library correspondence, (5) Study of, and practice in various systems of classification, (6) Bibliography, use of books, etc., (7) Original work in arranging, cataloguing, indexing, making shelf and finding lists, etc., of some portion of the library.<sup>47</sup>

No record of topics actually discussed or the names of those who desired to take the course have been preserved, but by the year 1897-98 a more formalized program was outlined with an admission requirement of an education equivalent to that given in high school and a tuition fee of \$37.50. Just as Drexel Institute had awarded initially certificates for the completion of its program, so did Syracuse announce that certificates would be granted for the completion of the full course, which was "intended to give students such training as will enable them to fill competently any position in a library." An opportunity for practice work was

offered both within the library of the University and the central or public library of Syracuse.<sup>48</sup>

The immediate impetus for the revised program appears to have been the desire of Mrs. Esther Baker Steele, a Trustee of the University, to have her niece, Mrs. Kate Deane Andrew, trained as a librarian for the public library of Elmira, New York. Whatever the motivation, Mrs. Sibley, many years later, in reviewing the origin of the school, emphasized that Dr. Sibley had had no alternative but to organize the program because of pressure from those wanting instruction and that the school had been organized "without available endowment for an appropriation, in a crowded, ill-adapted library building, with the library in a transition stage."<sup>49</sup>

Instruction from the beginning was offered by Dr. Sibley and Mary Jane Sibley (Mrs. H. O. Sibley), assistant librarian, who had also received a degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1892. While neither of the instructors had pursued any study in the then existing library schools, there is some evidence that Dr. Sibley had planned his curriculum in an awareness of the 1896 Report of the Committee on Library School and Training Classes.<sup>50</sup> It is likely that the Report, which criticized the Institutes for emphasizing belles-lettres with a consequent neglect of the literature of other areas, fostered the demand that one of the required textbooks be Sibley's *Tabular Method*, which consisted "of a classified selection of prominent authors in *all* departments of knowledge."

Dr. Sibley continued to teach and direct the program until 1904, after which date Mrs. Sibley administered both the school and the library. It was not until after the critical appraisal of Syracuse<sup>51</sup> in the 1903 Report of the Committee on Library Training that a graduate of a library school was added to the faculty—Margaret Ann Emerson, an Albany graduate of the class of 1902-3.<sup>52</sup> Meanwhile the school continued to prepare its graduates for various positions in libraries.

In Illinois: the University of Chicago. The University of Chicago included in its extension program, in the later 1890's, instruction in library economy at the request of the Bureau of Information of the Illinois State Library Association. Twelve lessons were offered through the class-study program by university instructors. No entrance examination was required for admission; only the payment of \$6.00 by at least six people for their lessons and "their share of the instructor's traveling expenses." Mrs. Zella Allen Dixson, associate librarian of the University Library, and Katharine L. Sharp, director of the Department of Library Economy at Armour Institute, taught the courses originally. Miss Sharp directed the programs at the Cleveland Public Library in December, 1896, and at Geneva, Illinois, in January, 1897. At the University of Chicago, the first class was offered in January, 1897, by Mrs. Dixson.<sup>53</sup>

Though the course had been planned "to aid in an intelligent use of the library rather than to afford special library training,"<sup>54</sup> it became quickly apparent that the persons who attended were more interested in



becoming librarians. Consequently the original purpose was abandoned. During the years before the 1903 Report of the Committee on Library Training, the course was lengthened and was identified as being designed to train librarians and library assistants. For admission, the students were required to have two years of college education or its equivalent.

Students from the beginning, however, did not remain to complete the program, for between the dates 1897-1902 only nine out of thirty-six registrants completed the course.<sup>55</sup> In 1902-3, the year in which the Committee on Library Training was making its survey, only eight out of twenty-nine persons completed the course.<sup>56</sup> The program was under the direction of Josephine Chester Robertson,<sup>57</sup> who, according to the 1903 Committee report, was without formal training.<sup>58</sup>

### Training programs in public libraries

Just as the Los Angeles Public Library had been compelled for practical reasons to establish a training class to provide for its own staff, so had other libraries, but few planned as deliberately as did Los Angeles to offer a highly systematized curriculum. That variant forms of training within public libraries were developing prompted the Committee on Library School and Training Classes to explore the field in order to gather information on the opportunities to enter the profession by apprentice training. An inquiry from the Committee, addressed to one hundred libraries throughout the country, each of which from its "size or circumstances could be supposed to offer facilities for training in library work" revealed that only seven out of eighty libraries expressed a willingness to receive apprentices. Of the remaining seventy-three respondents which stated that they trained their own assistants, the Minneapolis Public Library, the only one identified by name, indicated that it did not care to enlarge its apprentice class.<sup>59</sup>

Presumably among the seven willing to receive apprentices was the Los Angeles Public Library, for Miss Kelso let it be known at the 1893 Conference that the Library promised nothing in the way of employment but that it did attempt to find positions for its trainees.<sup>60</sup> The foremost imitator of the Los Angeles program was John Cotton Dana, who organized similar programs, first in Denver and later in Springfield, Massachusetts.

#### *In Denver*

In 1893, in the same year that the Armour Institute program was planned, Dana organized a training class in the Denver Public Library, which, according to the first publicity released to the *Library Journal* was organized

on the same lines as the training classes of the Los Angeles and other libraries, and gives thorough instruction in library work from the pasting of labels and care of periodicals to study of cataloging and classification, courses in literature, and instruction in library finances.<sup>61</sup>

The intent of the course, as defined by Dana, appeared to be far more serious than it was adjudged to be by Chalmers Hadley, who implied that Dana had started the apprentice class because of his belief that "a helpful and hospitable spirit in the attendants is the first essential of a library's success."<sup>62</sup>

Though the plans were carefully made, the program was discontinued in 1897 because there was not enough space to accommodate the pupils. It is possible also that Dana's own resignation was a contributing factor; nevertheless, his enthusiasm and recognition of the need for a training program were not diminished even though the Denver program was abandoned, for he organized a similar program at the Springfield Public Library after his appointment as librarian there.

### *In Springfield*

Dana readily announced that his second venture with a training program would be "similar to the classes conducted in the Denver, Los Angeles, and other libraries," the chief purpose being to prepare persons for effective work within the Springfield library.<sup>63</sup> The apprenticeship status of the program was emphasized by the decision that students would serve without pay in the various departments of the library for a period of nine months. Instruction, differing from that of the Institute programs, consisted of five hours weekly for the first six months of prescribed study in library economy and literature.

### *Other programs*

Programs which developed in the cities of Cleveland and Pittsburgh deserve some consideration in this chapter—the first, because with it was associated William Howard Brett, who was to become Dean of the Library School of Western Reserve University; the second, because from it evolved the Training Class for Children's Librarians. That, in turn, became the Carnegie Library School, one of the schools included in the Williamson report.

At Cleveland. The 1898 training class of the Cleveland Public Library was planned for six weeks only, during which period the principal instructor was Esther Crawford, a graduate of the New York State Library School. According to Brett, the purpose of the school was to give the assistants "an opportunity to secure some part of the discipline and training of the regular schools giving the full two years' course."<sup>64</sup> Upon the completion of the course by twenty-five students, all of whom met the entrance requirement of graduation from a reputable high school or an equivalent education, Brett praised the instruction and expressed his conviction that the experience would prove of value to the work of the library.<sup>65</sup> The importance of the program lies not in its having improved the quality of the work, though such an improvement would have justified the experiment, but in Brett's effort to pattern the program after that of the regular library schools, not the training classes of public libraries. It was a stimulant which made him an active proponent of

the establishment of a Library School in Cleveland, an accomplishment of the early twentieth century.

At Pittsburgh. Though Andrew Carnegie had donated a million dollars to the city of Pittsburgh in 1890,<sup>66</sup> it was not until 1895 that library services were available to the public. Edwin Hatfield Anderson, a graduate of the New York State Library School, was appointed librarian and, in his program for organizing and administering the collection, he included plans for a training class which began on January 1, 1895. On that date six trainees, who had passed an entrance examination, were admitted.<sup>67</sup> Since it was understood from the beginning, however, that the newly trained assistants would be given an opportunity either to remain in Pittsburgh or go to other libraries in the region, the class was appropriately designated a training class.

In the first class there was little or no emphasis on children's work, for originally no provision had been made for a separate children's department. However, the demands were so insistent that the Board of Trustees created a children's reading room on February 1, 1896.<sup>68</sup> The continuing increase in attendance and in circulation and the inclusion of children's rooms in the branch libraries necessitated the subsequent organization of a Children's Department.<sup>69</sup> Under the successful direction of Frances Jenkins Olcott, also a graduate of the New York State Library School, the work expanded so rapidly that it was impossible to train assistants properly though they had studied in the Pittsburgh and Allegheny College. Therefore on October 1, 1900, a formal Training Class was begun and arrangements were made for co-operation with the Kindergarten College. The Class, for which an attendance fee of \$50 was charged, was planned to cover two years of lecture and apprentice work, the latter under supervision.<sup>70</sup>

The co-operative plan with the College implied a thoroughness in specialized training that characterized the program at the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. In 1901 plans for the second year's program were announced for a training school for children's librarians for Pittsburgh and other places, "not competing in any way with the general library schools." The courses, in addition to the subjects of cataloging, reference, and other traditional topics, included

planning and equipment of children's rooms, administration of children's rooms, literature for children, bulletin and picture work, story-telling and reading aloud, relations between libraries and schools, home libraries, [and] psychology.<sup>71</sup>

Though the establishment of the Training School justified the emphasis on specialization in children's work which had been evidenced during the 1897 and 1898 conferences of the American Library Association,<sup>72</sup> there appears to be no causal relationship between the two. When the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh assumed an initiative in serving its juvenile clientele, it assumed a concomitant responsibility to serve that clientele adequately. In fulfillment of that responsibility the Training School continued to flourish not only for the benefit of

Pittsburgh but for other libraries employing graduates of the School. Its future was assured in 1903 when Andrew Carnegie, having expressed an interest in the Training School for Children's Librarians, asked to be permitted to contribute \$5,000 a year for a three-year period, to the maintenance of the School.<sup>73</sup>

### Summer school programs

Summer programs, established for the purpose of providing some training to those unable financially, unqualified educationally, or perhaps, simply unwilling to attend the regular library schools, flourished also. In contrast to the Amherst program, to which beginners in the field were admitted, many of the schools emphasized that their programs were designed for librarians of smaller libraries or library assistants unable to attend the regular library schools. Consequently they tended to admit only those persons engaged in library work or under definite appointment. Potential librarians were advised not to look upon the summer programs as substitutes for the more complete training of the library schools and that the purpose of the summer schools was to make skillful those persons already in the field.<sup>74</sup>

Though many programs were organized, two types were identifiable throughout the country: (1) programs sponsored by state library commissions, such as those in the states of Wisconsin<sup>75</sup> and Minnesota;<sup>76</sup> (2) programs associated with academic institutions, such as those at the Ohio State University, in 1898,<sup>77</sup> under the direction of George E. Wire, a graduate of the Columbia School of Library Economy; at the University of Nebraska, in the year 1901-2, under the direction of James I. Wyer,<sup>78</sup> who later became director of the New York State Library School; at the State Normal School in Greeley, Colorado, under the direction of Joseph Francis Daniels.<sup>79</sup> It was he who organized later the Riverside Library Service School,<sup>80</sup> which was examined by Williamson, according to the complete report presented to the Carnegie Corporation.<sup>81</sup>

Within the state of New York, two summer programs were organized under the guidance of Melvil Dewey: (1) the 1896 summer program of the New York State Library School,<sup>82</sup> which was the first of the regular schools to organize such a program; (2) the school instituted at the Chautauqua Assembly in 1901. For the Chautauqua program, Dewey acted as general director; however, Mary E. Hazeltine, not a Library School graduate, served as resident director.<sup>83</sup>

### *The Wisconsin School*

Since, of all the summer schools, only one, that in Wisconsin, developed into a regular library school and was examined by Williamson in preparation for his report, its origin will be noted briefly.

Following the Chicago Conference of 1893 and the opening of the Armour Institute Library School, a Midwestern surge of interest in libraries and consequently in training manifested itself in Wisconsin.

Associated with the development of that training interest was Katharine L. Sharp, who addressed the fourth conference of the Wisconsin Library Association in 1895. The Association, recognizing that a paramount prerequisite for successful library work was a qualified staff, welcomed the offer made by Senator J. H. Stout, a trustee of the Menomonie Memorial Library, to underwrite the expenses of a Summer School in Library Economy.<sup>84</sup> The School, conducted in connection with the Summer School of the State University, was directed by Miss Sharp. Unlike the Amherst Summer School, the first program in the Midwest was influenced by the New York State Library School, for Miss Sharp was one of its graduates, associated also with the training program of the Armour Institute.

In a detailed and favorable summary of the Summer School,<sup>85</sup> Miss Sharp admitted that she had doubted the advisability of the course's being only four weeks in length but that after a careful study she felt convinced that it was practical and not a "harmful short-cut to superficial training." Her approval of the program was reinforced by a similar approval from Dewey, who wrote to Miss Sharp, "I consider the University of Wisconsin the best place in the Northwest for this work."

In 1899 the Summer School became officially a commission school, for in that year the Wisconsin Free Library Commission was empowered:

to conduct a summer school of library science in connection with the summer school of the University of Wisconsin, and to hold librarians' institutes in various parts of the state in order to train librarians . . . to make wiser and more effective use of the libraries in their charge.<sup>86</sup>

The Summer School had been unofficially associated with the Commission since the latter's establishment, however, for in its first biennial report appeared a lengthy report on the "Wisconsin Summer School of Library Science," by Maude A. Early.<sup>87</sup>

After the School's designation as a commission-sponsored agency, Cornelia Marvin, a graduate of the Armour Institute School, assumed the responsibility of the organizing work of the Commission and of directing the Summer School.<sup>88</sup> It proved increasingly satisfactory, and by 1906 the Commission was able to conduct a summer school and to establish a one-year program.<sup>89</sup> The enlarged program was made possible by an act of the Wisconsin legislature, by the gift of Andrew Carnegie to the city of Madison for the building in which the School would be located, and by the promise of co-operation from the libraries of Madison and the vicinity, including the University of Wisconsin.<sup>90</sup>

#### Footnote to chapter

This imperfect survey of training programs at the end of the nineteenth century has been included not in an attempt to offer a directory<sup>91</sup> but to depict the individualistic patterns which were emerging. No

guidance was being offered, however, either by the American Library Association or by the pioneer Library School. The acceptance of such guidance would have been problematical had it been offered, for the concept of an authoritative body, to examine or to standardize, was only to be hinted at—and then rejected—in the nineteenth century. In the following chapter, a study of the reactions to the diversified programs and proposals for new approaches to training, notably that of Aksel G. S. Josephson, will be made.

## In the last decade: proposals and recommendations

### REACTIONS AND NEW PROPOSALS, 1893-97

Although the American Library Association had offered both Miss Plummer and Fletcher an opportunity to discuss their new programs at the 1891 Conference, no official endorsements were issued, as had been done for the New York State Library School. It was not until 1893 that the Standing Committee of Three viewed the emergence of the newer programs as a tribute to the success of the Library School;<sup>1</sup> however, no effort was made to appraise their imitative qualities. Though no recommendation was made that the Committee report on new programs in the future, the Executive Board, through broadening the scope of the Standing Committee to the Committee on Library School and Training Classes,<sup>2</sup> acknowledged the increase in the number of agencies offering some form of training. The enlargement was also an indication that the Association was attempting to keep itself informed on developments, for, unlike Dewey, the directors of the newer programs had not sought either the approval or the recognition of the Association before formulating their plans.

Earlier in 1893, George Watson Cole, a member of the Standing Committee, had offered his opinion, which had not been included in the official Committee report, at the New York Library Club.<sup>3</sup> There he had stated that, however excellent the instruction given in the newer programs (the three Institute programs, the Amherst Summer School, and the Los Angeles Public Library Training Class) might be,

There can be little question that the high standard required for admission to the New York State Library School at Albany and the instruction given by its experienced faculty easily place it in the first rank among schools of this class not only in this country but in the world.

A similar appraisal was made later at a meeting of the Library Association in Belfast, where American library training was discussed. Again the Albany program was ranked above the others, for, though it was granted that all conducted classes on the same principles as Albany, there were two differences: (1) the other courses were not so long or

so complete; (2) the aim of the other courses was to produce good assistants rather than head librarians.<sup>4</sup>

Meanwhile, some attempt was being made within the American Library Association to review the programs more thoroughly than had been done in 1893.

#### Committee on Library School and Training Classes, 1894

It was not until 1894 that the Committee, conscious of its broadened scope, encompassed all the known programs in its report and, to some extent, by its arrangement, grouped the programs, without so stating, into these types: (1) the New York State Library School; (2) programs in the three Institutes; (3) training classes in public libraries—Los Angeles and Denver; (4) the Amherst Summer School; (5) instruction in colleges or universities—the programs at the Maine State College and the University of Colorado.<sup>5</sup> The reference to the Colorado class was a questionable inclusion, for it was not planned as instruction in library economy but rather in bibliographical guidance;<sup>6</sup> further, it was discontinued without fulfilling its potential after the sudden death of Dr. Charles Emmett Lowrey, the librarian.

To the extent that the Committee identified the programs as other than that of the New York State Library School, it fulfilled its responsibility. To the extent that the Committee failed to distinguish between a library school program and a training class, to define a “systematic curriculum” and the “character of instruction,” it assisted in obscuring the similarities and dissimilarities, if any, which actually existed. On the basis of the report, all programs other than that of the New York State Library School were categorized as training classes. Yet among the latter were discernible variations relating to reasons for establishment, admission requirements, instructional methods, and length of course.

The Committee was not alone in its failure to categorize specifically the programs, for the *Library Journal* had included in its September, 1894, issue a survey of “The Library School and Training Classes of the United States,”<sup>7</sup> which began: “There are at present six library schools in the United States . . . The summer school of library economy conducted at Amherst . . . brings the total number up to seven.”

#### View of William I. Fletcher, 1894

Neither did Fletcher in his book, *Public Libraries in America*, published in 1894, attempt to differentiate between the programs, yet he was particularly well qualified to do so because of his directorship of the Amherst Summer School. In a chapter on “The Librarian: His Work and His Training for It,”<sup>8</sup> which began somewhat disparagingly, “Librarianship is not one of the recognized learned professions,” he identified all the programs, including the Amherst Summer School, as training programs. He cited the New York State Library School only as a “more ambitious effort in this direction” begun by Dewey “on a



small scale at Columbia College in 1886." There were no qualifying statements concerning the instruction at the various schools, nor was the information up to date because of the omission of the Armour Institute program.

In a lengthy review of the book, by an unidentified P.L.F.,<sup>9</sup> no criticism was made of the chapter on training and it might be safe to assume, consequently, that either P.L.F. was himself disinterested or that he felt that the readers of his review were not concerned. Had Aksel G. S. Josephson not responded somewhat belatedly in 1896, little attention would have been focused on the chapter on training in the United States.

*Response from Aksel G. S. Josephson, 1896*

Aksel G. S. Josephson was prompted to inquire, two years after his attendance at the Library School—from October, 1893, to March, 1894—"Is librarianship a learned profession?" Noting that Fletcher had complained that librarianship was not being regarded as a profession, Josephson quoted Dr. Pietsch, who, in reviewing the book for the *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, had explained that the library schools and training classes could hardly supply the needs of a learned profession as they were then being conducted. Josephson agreed with Dr. Pietsch concerning the standard of the library training classes, though he felt that cataloging and the minor arts of library economy were well presented.

He scored, however, the inadequacy in the instruction of classification, observing that

The comparative study of the different systems of classification is greatly neglected, and of familiarizing the students with the principles of classification of knowledge as the foundation for the classification of books, there is next to nothing.<sup>10</sup>

In a sharp note of protest he objected to the efforts to make the work delightful for young ladies and felt that

Too much significance is given to the tendencies that are best explained by J. C. Dana in his *Denver Public Library Handbook* and repeated in the A.L.A. *Primer*: "A library is not a business office; it's a center of public happiness first, of public education next."

Deploing the theme of "happiness first," Josephson then advanced his own plan for training:

What is wanted is a school of bibliography and library science, *affiliated with one of the great universities*, under guidance of leaders of both scholarship and practical ability, and where could be studied what Sir Hamilton calls "Bibliography in its nobler sense, and in its useful application."<sup>11</sup> [*Italics mine.*]

Having identified his "school of bibliography and library science," Josephson concluded, as Dr. Pietsch had done, that the library schools

of 1896 could offer little to librarianship in its search for recognition among the learned professions. As of that date, Josephson acknowledged that he was unprepared to comment on the soundness of Dr. Pietsch's proposal "to admit only university graduates into the field."

A strange silence followed the appearance of Josephson's critical comments. Neither the volatile Dana nor the library schools offered refutations or justifications, but historically Josephson's plea for a scholarly curriculum content was the first constructive effort in the struggle to have library schools identified as truly professional and not totally technical schools. His was the first significant proposal that library schools be affiliated with universities—a concept later to be declared as fundamental by Williamson in his *Training for Library Service*.<sup>12</sup>

### Criticism from the Committee, 1896

In 1896 the Committee on Library School and Training Classes, assuming a more critical mien, attempted to evaluate the Library School and the Institute programs but abandoned the comparative study because of the extensive divergencies. For example, for the study of bibliography, for which Josephson had made a special plea, Pratt scheduled three lectures, whereas the New York State Library School allocated 9 per cent of its two-year program. Both Drexel and Armour included bibliography with reference, with Drexel allocating 14 per cent and Armour, 25 per cent in its two-year program.<sup>13</sup>

Specific criticisms were directed toward the Institutes concerning the amount of time devoted to belles-lettres with a consequent neglect of other areas of knowledge, wherein, according to the Committee, more than half of the problems and difficulties of library service arose. Other subjects of dubious value cited were English composition, book-keeping or accounts, economics, and typewriting. Though the schools had ignored Josephson's proposal, both Drexel and Pratt responded to the 1896 report. Drexel defended the expenditure of time on the study of literature on the basis of the relative ignorance of the candidates of that branch of knowledge; Pratt clarified some misinformation concerning the amount of time spent in the study of bibliography and of the loan system, noting that it was a misunderstanding of the nomenclature used in the class schedule.<sup>14</sup> Neither indicated that any change had occurred because of the report.

### Proposal for specialized training in children's work, 1897

In 1897, ten years after the establishment of the School of Library Economy, which had attempted to encompass, in its lecture series, aspects of training for all areas, the American Library Association included on its agenda a study of methods of library work with children. In contrast to the slight attention given to the Committee report, which was cited by title only, two papers were read in full on "Methods of Children's Work as Determined by the Needs of the Children"—one by

Edwin Milton Fairchild, of the Educational Church Board, Albany, New York;<sup>15</sup> the other, by Emma Louise Adams, librarian of the Plainfield, New Jersey, Public Library.<sup>16</sup> It was Fairchild, the observer, rather than Miss Adams, the librarian, who spoke of the need for specialized training. After presenting comprehensive observations on child psychology and their applicability to the librarian's responsibilities, Fairchild emphasized that

Not only must the children's librarian be well fitted by natural personal qualities for her position, but intellectually she must be *thoroughly and specially trained for children's library work.* [Italics mine.]

It was probably not by accident that, two weeks before the Conference, Mary Salome Cutler (later Mrs. E. M. Fairchild), of the New York State Library School, had announced that she was interested in working out the proper course for the training of children's librarians. Either anticipating or echoing Fairchild's sentiments, Miss Cutler added:

We have yet to learn that the children's librarian, if her work is worth doing at all, needs not only the general training, scholastic and technical, recognized as essential for those who have charge of other departments, but also a special training for her peculiar work. This special training will probably include a part of that taken by the kindergartner, a course in child-study according to modern methods and a careful analysis of children's literature.<sup>17</sup>

While Miss Plummer of Pratt supplemented Fairchild's recognition of the need for special training, she cautioned that no amount of intellectual training would make up "for the lack of patience and fairness and of a genuine interest in children and realization of their importance in the general scheme."<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, both the New York State Library School and Pratt Institute responded to the plea for specialized training, the former including, as of 1898, one elective course in children's work; the latter, announcing that three students would specialize in work for children during the 1899 term.

Students at Pratt, however, had been aware, before that date, of children's work which was being directed by Annie (Anne) Carroll Moore. At the 1898 Conference, Miss Moore proposed, on the basis of her having observed the results at Pratt when the students in the general course were exposed to children's work, that "Special Training for Children's Librarians"<sup>19</sup> should include: (1) storytelling, both reproductive and original, with the aid of pictures and without them; (2) practice in the condensation of a subject without sacrificing the interest; (3) study of the public school curriculum; (4) study of local topography; (5) some practical psychology.

The first area of specialization to receive implementation and to stimulate curriculum planning, as can be seen readily, was training for library work with children. The greatest impetus was to occur in 1901

when the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh announced that it would concentrate on specialized training for children's librarians.

#### LIBRARY TRAINING AS VIEWED AFTER A DECADE AT THE CHAUTAUQUA CONFERENCE

The fortuitous participation of Melvil Dewey in planning the program for the Chautauqua Conference of 1898 resulted in a decennial appraisal of library training by the Association, for it was agreed by the Executive Board that one of the topics would be "The Training of Librarians and Assistants."<sup>20</sup> That out of a registration of 500, one-fourth were former students or graduates of the New York State Library School, the University of Illinois, Drexel, and Pratt justified the emphasis on training and provided a receptive and an unexpectedly well-informed audience. It was to that audience that Herbert Putnam delivered his presidential address on the topics to be discussed, one being education for the profession of librarianship.<sup>21</sup>

Observing first the claim to professionalism despite the absence of requirements of special educational qualifications or formal tests, Putnam appealed to those believing in librarianship as a profession that some attention be given to prerequisites. Not only was the Conference to consider the prerequisites; it was, according to Putnam, to be presented with a survey of formal and informal programs in order to determine what were the essentials in training. While acknowledging that it was but fifteen years since Dewey's plan had aroused some astonished opposition, Putnam warned that the opposition had been grounded in the fear that such schools might induce a disregard for a thorough general education by overemphasizing specialized training in the techniques of library work. The appraisal after the first decade provided an opportunity for the membership of the Association to hear whether the programs, as constituted in 1898, were calculated to discountenance or sustain that fear.

And hear the Association did: (1) from the four schools which were tending to be identified as library schools—the New York State Library School, the University of Illinois, and the two Institute schools; (2) from one training class, the Los Angeles Public Library; (3) from five summer school programs—the New York State Summer School, the Wisconsin Summer School, the Amherst Summer School, the Summer School of the Cleveland Public Library, and the Ohio State University Summer School.<sup>22</sup>

#### The reports of 1898

Distinguishing characteristics of each program were presented by a representative of that program in a manner reminiscent of the reports given at the Conference of 1891. The first, fittingly presented by Dewey, identified the special characteristics of the New York State Library School as being its high requirements for admission and performance.

In attempting to assume an authority concomitant with seniority, Dewey delivered as the message from Albany:

We will try in various ways to do the work that some of the other schools may not find it practicable to do, so that, all together, the different agencies for training for librarianship shall accomplish the maximum amount of good; and if it seems that elsewhere they can do better work than we are doing, so far as lies in our power we shall aid that work, regardless of our own comfort or of the selfish interest of our geographic vicinity, to the extent of the large facilities placed in our hands, and will contribute to it the best that we can do for librarianship as a whole.<sup>23</sup>

Despite the magnanimous gesture of Dewey to assist librarianship as a whole, he either failed to see or ignored the implications inherent in the diversified and individualistic approaches made to training on the basis of the reports presented by the directors of the various programs. He made no attempt to sponsor a symposium on library schools or to include in the curriculum a special course of instruction for those interested in teaching, though the influence of the Library School had been noted in the 1894 Committee report. Neither did there appear to be a desire on the part of the directors, particularly of the Institute schools and the University of Illinois—all graduates of the parent Library School—to confer with one another about their programs, to invite criticisms of their curricula, or to attempt to standardize entrance requirements. Each presented a report with little or no reference to the existing programs. The individual reports were largely recapitulative of the contents of the reports of the Committee on Library School and Training Classes, but within them were observable trends.

### *Trends*

It was increasingly evident that the New York State Library School and the University of Illinois Library School were assuming positions of leadership because of their admission requirements and their two-year programs. Even more was it evident that the Illinois School, within its university environment, was attaining an academic status, from which the New York School was isolated but which it would have had, had the School prospered within the environment of Columbia College.

The two Institute programs were leveling off on a common stratum, for both emphasized the importance of practical work in their respective libraries: Drexel, with its one-year program, accepted more realistically the confines of its program, whereas Pratt referred ambitiously to its second-year program, which was planned to offer specialization in the historical and bibliographical areas and in work with children. The program seemed particularly ambitious in view of Miss Plummer's statement that Pratt's admission policy gave precedence to the personality of the candidate rather than to his educational attainment and her concern over the needs of the average or small library.

### From the membership

After having heard the individual reports, which could not fully assuage the fear identified by Putnam, the Association considered three problems posed by the diversified programs; the problems concerned: (1) the number of schools needed; (2) a proposal for an examining board; (3) apprenticeship training.

#### *The number of schools needed*

Inherent in the question addressed to the membership was concern over the proliferation of training programs, for the membership was asked to consider:

Will the interests of the profession be best served by a few well-equipped schools with strong faculties, at central points, or by a large number of smaller schools and classes scattered widely through the country?<sup>24</sup>

Even at the time of the query, the question was largely academic since in 1898 both types of programs were represented; but in spite of Fletcher's objection to the question, since "we have both and are going to have more of both," there was some discussion. The participants, including Fletcher, who regarded it as an unnecessary question, were Silas H. Berry, librarian, Y.M.C.A. Library, New York City, who advocated centralization because of the need for adequate equipment, and Anne Wallace, librarian, Y.M.L. Association, Atlanta, Georgia, who felt that *both* types were needed.

To the discussion were added the voices of Dewey and Mrs. Fairchild, the only two of the participants associated with a library school. Dewey did not object to the training classes as such but did object to using the term "professional" in connection with that type of training because, according to him, "We want librarianship on the plane of one of the learned professions." Of the comments, that of Fletcher was most realistic in its acceptance that both types would continue to be developed.

#### *Proposal for an examining board*

The most penetrating analysis of the problems inherent in the continuing establishment of all types of training programs was that made by W. H. Brett, librarian, Cleveland Public Library, and director of the Summer School which was to begin on August 1 in Cleveland. Basing his response on three assumptions: (1) that the schools in existence were not adequate to meet the needs; (2) that more schools would be emerging; (3) that the Association should consider what form of school is best suited to the need and encourage the establishment of schools of that type, Brett viewed the problem as analogous to that in the field of education. Noting the benefits and disadvantages of the rapid multiplication of professional schools, such as normal schools and law schools, Brett emphasized that, as law schools had developed in number, a plan

of examination, by a state commissioner, for admission to the bar had emerged as a possible safeguard against superficial and inadequate instruction.<sup>25</sup>

He praised the high standards of the New York State Library School and the accomplishments of the other schools, established by its graduates, as being an assurance that there was no dangerous tendency toward inferior training. At the same time he urged the smaller schools to recognize their limitations and to "aim at thorough training in the fundamental things rather than attempt to cover a larger field less thoroughly."

His major proposal, notable not for its immediate adoption, but for its antedating a similar proposal to be made by Williamson in 1919,<sup>26</sup> was for the creation of an examining board which would award diplomas to candidates from all schools. With such a safeguard, according to Brett,

other schools might safely be established, as needed, and the largely endowed, fully equipped, ideal library school of the future may develop from one of the smaller schools of the present.

At a later session, Brett reiterated his proposal for an examining board similar to that which examined law students. He stipulated further that those who prepared themselves for library work in *any way* should present themselves for examination, should receive diplomas or certificates, and that those diplomas and certificates should be current anywhere in the country.<sup>27</sup> Melvil Dewey quickly supported Brett and moved that the "executive board be requested to formulate a plan looking to a system of library examinations and credentials."<sup>28</sup> The motion, adopted without discussion, was implemented by the appointment of a Committee on Library Examinations and Credentials at the Executive Board meeting of November 25, 1898.<sup>29</sup>

### *Apprentice training*

Dissident views concerning formal training were expressed by the membership, two critics being William I. Fletcher and Reuben Gold Thwaites, secretary of the Wisconsin State Historical Society. Fletcher's known skepticism seemed inconsistent with his directorship of the Amherst Summer School, for he had stated:

It may well be doubted whether it will ever appear that the men foremost as bibliographers and scholarly librarians, or even as skilful and shrewd and wise librarians, adorning and elevating the calling, owe their power to library school training.<sup>30</sup>

He accepted as the sole contribution of the schools the elevation of the level of work performed in small libraries—the filling-in of the valleys, not the adding to the height of mountains. Such a contribution he presumably accepted as that of the Amherst program. Yet he was not willing to abandon formal training, for when confronted with the issue

of apprentice *versus* formal training, Fletcher concluded that, regardless of the advantage of practicality of experience,

None the less must "apprenticeship" as a means of library training, fine as its results have been in the past, yield the palm to the more philosophical and more truly effective system of the library school.<sup>31</sup>

Thwaites on apprentice training. Reuben Gold Thwaites weighed the merits and demerits of professional training, citing the latter as being

a lack of working familiarity with a many-sided public, which cannot be gained from lectures, and can come only from long experience and observation; a liability to undue influence from instructors, who, however gifted and enthusiastic, are apt, from the nature of their calling, to be warped by fads, and to instil into their inexperienced pupils notions and methods which, though attractive in theory, may not stand the tests of the practical library world; and the cultivation of the opinion that the possession of a school diploma marks the finished librarian.<sup>32</sup>

In contrast he emphasized that the apprentice, working under the ideal chief, would inevitably obtain better all-round training, at least for that library, than the graduate of a library school.

Thwaites concluded that a combination of the two methods would be desirable, particularly if the candidates for library school would spend a year, prior to entering library school, as unpaid novitiates. This he advocated because of confessions from library school graduates that their first two or three years had been periods of disillusionment during which time adjustments were made to fit practical conditions.

Thwaites, more so than Fletcher, presented extremely critical comments on professional training. He offered the somewhat distorted appraisal that the graduate must unlearn much taught in library schools and learn new things not possible to be taught, or, in short, that the graduate must become an apprentice after he becomes a graduate. Despite his emphasis on the discouragement and disillusionment suffered by the library school graduate, Thwaites failed to consider that the disillusionment, if suffered, might well have been a legitimate response to the situation in the field and that it could have been a stimulus for growth and change, not an opiate inducing acceptance of malpractice. Yet no one, among the graduates present, challenged Thwaites's undocumented personal evaluations.

Hannah P. James, supporting to some extent Thwaites's views, proposed that library school students undertake what today would be called an internship for six months or a year after graduation, working especially at the delivery desk, where the relative value of what one had been taught would be made apparent.<sup>33</sup>



### Contributions of the Conference

The Conference of 1898 offered, for the first time since the establishment of the first School of Library Economy, an opportunity for librarians to probe their feelings and express their reactions in regard to the problems of training. Discontent was manifested: the discontent of practicing librarians with the library school graduate; the suspicion of librarians, without formal training, in their appraisal of the graduate. The emphasis on the need of specialized training, particularly in work with children, and the acknowledgment of the problems inherent in the rapid multiplication of varied training programs anticipated the twentieth-century trends in education.

In spite of the comprehensive survey of the various forms of training, the Conference accomplished only half of its purpose if, according to Putnam, it was not only to hear but to determine the essentials in a training program as well as the type of program most likely to supply those essentials. No committee was appointed to determine which method of training was most commendable, but a committee was appointed to formulate plans for library examinations and credentials. Whereas Brett, in his proposal for an examining board, had assumed that the examination should be given to those who had prepared for library work *in any way* without indicating that the examinations be classified according to type of training, Dewey had skillfully modified the proposal to the formulation of a plan looking to a *system* of library examinations and credentials. In so doing he was anticipating the formulation of standards according to type of training agency. Had such a system been devised by 1898, the emerging conflicts between the trained and the untrained, the library school and the apprentice graduate, might have been welded into a harmonious acceptance one of the other, but the formulation was to be less readily achieved than was the motion creating the Committee on Library Examinations and Credentials.

### Aftermath, 1898-99

Trans-Mississippi Library Congress. That the Conference of 1898 did not exhaust the subject of library training is evidenced by the continued discussion of it at the Trans-Mississippi Library Congress, held in connection with the Trans-Mississippi Exposition, September 29-30 and October 1. At the meeting, Electra C. Doren, of the Dayton Public Library, offered a strong defense of the value of formal training, which might well have been made at the 1898 Conference. She insisted that

Special training for library work does not encourage drones and the unfit to continue in it. If made the prime qualification for appointment, it relieves the administration of much embarrassment from pressure of political and social influence in the selection of assistants.<sup>34</sup>

While offering as a solution to the difficult problem of finding good assistants the establishment of training programs, Miss Doren revealed

continuing admiration for library schools. If refutations were made, they are not recorded in the summary report of the Congress.<sup>35</sup>

Report of the Committee on Library Schools, 1899. When, at the 1899 Conference, the Committee report consisted of repetitive and somewhat pedestrian comments from the directors of Pratt, Drexel, and the University of Illinois, plus comments on the New York State Library School by Gardner M. Jones, of the class of 1888,<sup>36</sup> it appeared that the Committee had regressed in function and was making a contribution little different from that at the earlier conferences. It is possible, however, that the Committee had been awaiting the report of the Committee on Library Examinations and Credentials, but that Committee faltered in its task, presenting only a perfunctory report. Because of its incomplete reporting, the life of the Committee was extended for another year.<sup>37</sup>

The attention given to the problem of training was in sharp contrast to that of the 1898 Conference, for, whatever the unexplained circumstances, the Committee on Library Schools offered only minimal justification for its continued existence. Fortunately for the interests of the Association, a more dynamic membership was chosen to study the problems for the ensuing year and to report in 1900.

#### JOSEPHSON'S PROPOSED CURRICULUM, 1900

Before the Committee report was made, Aksel G. S. Josephson, who had in 1896 proposed that a school of bibliography and library science be affiliated with one of the great universities, had formulated a curriculum for a two-year training program which, if adopted, would have redirected the current trend of having the second-year program an extension of the first. Concerned that the high entrance requirements might exclude those who might serve exceedingly well in the lower grades of professional work, Josephson proposed that a definite distinction be made whereby the junior course, or the first-year course, prepare for minor positions and the senior program, or second-year course, be an "independent post-graduate university course, in connection with some university with a large staff of instructors and rich libraries."<sup>38</sup>

Josephson strengthened his proposal by outlining the characteristics of each course at a meeting of the Chicago Library Club, as the following summation indicates:

##### *The junior program*

Purpose: To provide training for minor positions such as accession or order clerk, shelf lister, junior cataloger, etc.

Admission requirement: Minimum—graduation from high school.

Length of course: One year.

Degree or certification: No statement made.

Curriculum: Devoted entirely to professional studies of which cataloging and bibliography would be the major studies; omitted

would be the reading and current topic seminars offered in some of the schools.

Methods of instruction: Weekly seminar in library administration providing thereby an intelligent view of library work as a whole, home reading program on history of libraries and of printing and on library administration; for the minor aspects of library economy, such as accessioning, regarded as appendices to cataloging, minimal time to be devoted.

### *The senior program*

Purpose: To provide training for major or scholarly positions involving familiarity with the literature and the methods of study and investigation.

Admission requirements: College graduation; no examination. An examination to be required of graduates of the junior class who had spent a certain number of years in practical work.

Length of course: Minimum of one year's attendance for graduation; course not limited to one year.

Degrees: Two degrees, A.M. and Ph.D.

Curriculum: The central study should be classification, consisting of a preliminary, theoretical study of the history and methodology of the various sciences, showing the interrelation and possibilities of development; this to be followed by a comparative study of classification schemes with practice work.

Cataloging and bibliography ought to occupy a prominent place among the studies, greatest stress being laid upon skill in using books for bibliographic and reference purposes, and in the faculty of judging between conflicting rules for cataloging.

General library administration . . . to be studied both historically and practically, and to include library architecture, history of libraries, and archives.

Electives: Comparative history of literature, not only of belles-lettres, but of all branches of knowledge; paleography and the care of manuscripts; history of printing; courses in the university.

Thesis: Required. Emphasis placed on the need of historical and theoretical monographs in preference to papers on the treatment of pamphlets, book numbers, etc. Thesis might take the form of a bibliography.<sup>39</sup>

Though Josephson was advocating a more scholarly second-year program, he was at the same time advocating lowering the standards of admission in his first-year program, making them lower than those of the New York State Library School and the University of Illinois, which required two years of college, and even lower than those of the Institute schools, which required high school graduation and an entrance examination. Yet when Miss Katharine Sharp of the Illinois School was asked to comment on Josephson's scheme, she failed to note that disparity but

agreed that the bibliographical side should be very strong and, further, added that Illinois was constantly strengthening its course along that line.

Josephson's major contribution was not his curriculum planning but rather his attempt to develop programs for *specific types of positions*. A similar distinction was to be made by the Committee on Library Schools as to the purpose of training classes and library schools; but the Committee did not offer a similar plan for the one- and two-year programs of the four schools which it viewed critically. Presumably, however, John Cotton Dana, chairman of the Committee, was familiar with Josephson's concepts, for he acknowledged that he had received suggestions from the latter which he had incorporated into the 1900 report. There is little evidence of such incorporation, for the Committee projected no curriculum improvements other than to suggest less emphasis on cataloging and classification, the latter subject being the one which would have dominated Josephson's second year.

#### THE CONFERENCE OF 1900: COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The election of Reuben Gold Thwaites to the presidency of the American Library Association for the year 1899-1900 elevated to that office one apparently hostile to the concept of professional training, if his advocacy of apprenticeship training in 1898 reflected his basic attitude. He used, however, a more conciliatory tone in his presidential address, wherein he noted, without reference to his earlier comments, that the library schools, like the training schools of other professions, had encountered adverse criticisms from those wedded to older methods but that they had also "fairly won the commendation of a large majority of our membership." He stated further that their continual improvement was evident.<sup>40</sup>

In contrast to the complimentary reappraisal of library schools by Thwaites was the report of the Committee on Library Schools, which offered no similar assurance that the schools had won the commendation of a large majority of the Association. The report was particularly significant because of: (1) its critical evaluation of library schools; (2) its comments on formal and apprentice training, which reflected the late nineteenth-century attitudes and were to encompass much of the thinking of the early twentieth century; (3) its forceful recommendations, which activated the American Library Association into adding a bylaw to its constitution concerning a Committee on Library Training.

#### Report of the Committee on Library Schools and responses to it

The Committee, composed of Adelaide R. Hasse, John Cotton Dana, and F. M. Crunden, forthrightly acknowledged that their personal examination of the schools had been almost nil and that their comments were based on observations of graduates, conversations with instructors, printed reports, and answers to letters of inquiry. Of the three members

Miss Hasse had served on the 1896 Committee which had attempted to evaluate the library school programs by comparing their curricula. Though the Committee had abandoned the plan because the divergencies had appeared extensive, it is possible that Miss Hasse, when reappointed to the Committee, stimulated interest in pursuing a similarly evaluative plan. Whatever the stimulation, the report of 1900 seems in many ways to be a continuation of that of 1896, whereas the intervening reports of 1897, 1898, and 1899 may be viewed as extraneous, having little relevance to the masterly report of 1900.<sup>41</sup>

### *Its critical evaluation of library schools*

From the sources on which the Committee relied were collected data which summarized and depicted the growth and status of the four library schools. The data showed not only that Illinois had the largest enrollment, having enrolled for the two-year program fifty students, but also that Illinois was offering the lengthiest curriculum—1,620 hours as compared to the 1,400 hours being offered by Drexel. Other data characterizing the programs related to: (1) admission requirements; (2) qualifications of the instructors; (3) curriculum content; (4) employment of graduates.

Admission requirements. The admission requirements of Albany<sup>42</sup> and Illinois, the oldest and the youngest of the four schools, were the same: high school graduation and two years of college; of Drexel and Pratt, the same: high school education and an examination.

Qualifications of the instructors. Both the educational qualifications of the instructors and their experience appeared quite limited. Illinois had a higher percentage of its faculty, 66 2/3 per cent, who were college graduates; at Albany, 45.5 per cent were college graduates. Drexel had no college graduates as instructors and of Pratt's sixteen, the four who were graduates were outside lecturers.

The instructors at Albany and Illinois brought more experience into the classroom, again with Illinois leading with 50 per cent of its faculty having had some experience; 36.3 per cent of the faculty at Albany. A footnote to the report cleared Drexel of the charge that its faculty brought no experience into the classroom. When compared, on the basis of education and experience, to the faculties of Drexel and Pratt, however, those of Illinois and Albany were better qualified as of 1900.

Curriculum content. Table 1, based on the statistical data contained in the report, presents the percentage distribution of the time allocated to the different subjects.

Failure of the Committee to analyze more thoroughly the subjects included under "All other topics" makes the table less meaningful as an interpretation of curriculum content, particularly since at Pratt Institute 76.8 per cent of the time was allocated to that elusive "other," and at Illinois, 72 per cent. From the table, it appears that cataloging dominated the instruction at Drexel, where 40 per cent of the hours were allocated to it, and also at Albany, where 35.5 per cent of the hours

TABLE 1  
DISTRIBUTION OF HOURS ACCORDING TO SUBJECTS IN THE  
CURRICULA OF THE FOUR LIBRARY SCHOOLS, 1900

Subjects	Distribution of hours							
	Albany		Drexel		Illinois		Pratt	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Cataloging. . . . .	540	35.5	560	40.0	312	19.3	230	15.4
Classification . . . .	93	6.2	40	2.9	116	7.2	106	7.0
Bookmaking. . . . .	80	5.3	16	1.1	24	1.5	12	.8
All other topics . . .	807	53.0	784	56.0	1168	72.0	1152	76.8
Total . . . . .	1520	100	1400	100	1620	100	1500	100

were allocated to the subject. When cataloging and classification are considered as one subject, both Drexel and Albany devoted more time to those topics than did Illinois and Pratt: Drexel allocated 42.9 per cent; Albany, 41.7 per cent; Illinois, 26.5 per cent; Pratt, 22.4 per cent.

The Committee, having examined the subject content of the curricula concluded, "We believe that too much attention, relatively, is given to the subjects of cataloging and classification." After noting that the emphasis on cataloging and classification was probably due to the adaptability of the two subjects for teaching purposes, the Committee expressed regret that

Apprentices and library school students almost invariably think cataloging the most important part of library work, because it is the most technical, and the time given to it in the schools encourages them in this thought.

Employment of graduates. The charge of overemphasis on cataloging and classification would have been more meaningful if it had been related to the types of positions held by the graduates of the schools and in answer to the question, "Are the schools which emphasize cataloging and classification providing the catalogers for the profession?" On the basis of the data contained in Table I and the data which appear in the 1900 report, the following answer could have been given:

The statistics of placement reveal that, of the 377 graduates employed in libraries as of 1900, 119 or 31.5 per cent were employed as catalogers; however, though Albany and Drexel were devoting more than 40 per cent of their curricula to cataloging and classification and Illinois only 26.5 per cent, Illinois had more graduates employed as catalogers in 1900 than did either Albany or Drexel. At Illinois, 22 out of 50 graduates, or 44.6 per cent, were employed as catalogers, whereas at Albany only 39 out of 139, or 28.6 per cent, were so employed. Such conclusions as these are not valid, however, for it is quite possible that some of the graduates employed in other areas of work might have begun as catalogers; indeed, such an assumption seems quite likely when one

recalls that the nineteenth century was the period of rapid expansion of libraries and consequently a time for organization and systematization of collections. In its criticism, the Committee might have pointed out the anomaly in the overemphasis on cataloging and classification by a more detailed review of the needs of the profession or by a more detailed examination of the subjects grouped under "All other topics," wherein might have been found an area of experimentation. For such a study, the school notes in the monthly issues would have been an excellent source, for it was the "other topics" which were being reported, for example, Drexel's biweekly reports of current events,<sup>43</sup> Pratt's provision for a course in Latin paleography,<sup>44</sup> New York State's emphasis on book notes,<sup>45</sup> and theses written at Illinois, such as "School Libraries in Indiana," by Minnie Earl Sears.<sup>46</sup> Nevertheless, the criticism itself, that there was an overemphasis, was a *preview* of twentieth-century concern over cataloging and classification.

Other criticisms. The emerging problem of specialization and/or library training was touched upon when the Committee criticized the schools for not making it possible for librarians of large libraries with special departments to select from the graduates persons with special training. Especially cited was the neglect of the administrative problems of the state and college libraries in contrast to the emphasis on the free circulating library.

As its final appraisal, the Committee concluded that, on the basis of its investigation, the schools seemed worthy of the praise found in previous reports "as regards courses of study, distribution of work, technical equipment, strict attention to business, and enthusiasm of both instructors and pupils."

#### *Belated response to the criticism of curriculum content*

The library schools offered neither refutation nor explanation in regard to curricula content other than for Dewey's praise of the report which called attention to the weaknesses of the schools. Instead of his giving attention to criticisms of the curricula, he acknowledged that some of the graduates of Albany were weak. Of them he philosophized:

You can polish agate; you can polish mahogany; but you can't polish a pumpkin—and if a third-rate man comes to a library school, and the Lord made him third-rate, he will be a third-rate librarian to the end of the chapter.<sup>47</sup>

At the New York Library Association. Three months later, the Committee report formed the basis for a discussion on "Curriculum of Library Schools" at the meeting of the New York Library Association.<sup>48</sup> At that time, Josephine Rathbone responded specifically to the two criticisms regarding: (1) overemphasis on cataloging and free library circulating work and (2) the failure to offer specialized training or to differentiate in administrative problems. Her practical explanation was simply that the schools were not being called upon to fill those positions

but were being asked instead to recommend graduates to fill the positions of librarian, reference assistant, and cataloger in public libraries. She urged further discussion, since the library schools wished to learn from librarians in what ways the courses could be enlarged or improved.

Among the criticisms recorded were those relating to the faculty's lack of experience, their isolation from the stress of library work, and the proposal that library school students should know books thoroughly. Dewey made a plea for continuing co-operation between the libraries and the schools by proposing that librarians, after observing the graduates, advise the schools of those things which should be supplied for the bettering of the programs.

*Its comments on formal and apprentice training*

Since two of the three Committee members were John Cotton Dana, who had had long acquaintance with library training programs both in Denver and in Springfield, and Adelaide R. Hasse, who had achieved no small fame because of her earlier connection with the Training Class of the Los Angeles Public Library, it is not surprising to find the Committee's stating that "no form of education for librarianship should be, in our opinion, discouraged." To support their opinion, however, the Committee attacked various aspects of formal training in what frequently appeared to be petulant and captious tone and sometimes unsubstantiated in content. Such appraisals as the following lessened the objectivity of the report:

All schools, and especially all schools which profess to prepare one quickly for a certain narrow field, are subject to the blight of the cult, the mildew of the -ism, and the megaloccephaly of the diploma.

In identifying the graduate of a formal training program, the Committee observed that

The graduate of a technical school has usually, no doubt, as compared with average non-schooled people, a little more enthusiasm, a little wider acquaintance with the literature of her profession and a certain glibness in the use of the patter of her calling which she sometimes mistakes for breadth, and others not initiated sometimes take for depth.

The Committee expressed the conviction again that most librarians, when given a choice between a person who had worked in a library like their own for two years or one who was a library school graduate with no experience, would prefer the former. This was viewed as an indication that the general opinion held that persons well experienced in library economy did not make a "better teaching force by calling themselves a school" than did a similar group forming the staff of a library.

Comparing the placement of the library school and the training school graduate, the Committee felt that formal training did not increase



one's value over that of a trained apprentice when the position under consideration was: (1) a secondary place in a large library; (2) head of a department in a medium library; (3) head of a small library. The criticism which elicited the greatest protest was the charge that

An organized school, with its graduates as its friends, with the prestige of its name, its courses, etc., can and does have great influence in the matter of securing positions for its students.

Though the criticisms were generally depreciative, the Committee granted that library schools did impart a breadth of vision and general zeal not characteristically found in apprenticeship trainees. In conclusion, the Committee asserted that the schools were good things and were doing good work and urged the Association to help elevate their standards but to avoid overestimating their present worth. That the third member of the Committee, Frank P. Hill, did not share the views expressed was not officially reported; yet had his opinions been appended, they would have counterbalanced many of the pejorative implications contained in the report. Though he offered no objection at the Conference, he spoke out belatedly during the meeting of the New York Library Association in behalf of library schools. As if presenting an antithesis to the Committee report, he stated that: (1) library schools did not maneuver in finding employment for their graduates; (2) he would prefer employing a library school graduate rather than an assistant who had had two years' experience in a public library; (3) schools could not be expected to give experience to their students but they could give training fitting them to assume responsibilities; (4) library school courses would be extended by necessity.<sup>49</sup>

### *Its recommendations*

The Committee emphasized at the beginning of the report that the Association

take such steps as will put it in close touch with education for librarianship and will enable it to give or withhold its endorsement of schools or training classes with an assurance born of full knowledge.

In order to implement the proposal, five recommendations were offered:

1. That the Committee on Library Schools be changed into a Committee on Instruction in Librarianship;
2. That this committee include not less than five members, and that each member thereof serve for at least three years.
3. That one or more members of the committee be required to visit, during each year, such library schools and training classes as the Association shall specify, the travelling expenses of each member to be paid by the Association.
4. That each year the committee make a report on such library schools and classes as the Association may designate, with special reference to the character of the students who are admitted

to the school, the courses of study therein, and the grade of instructors and the character of instruction.

5. That the committee make to the Association such recommendation in regard to these schools as may, under the circumstances, be warranted.<sup>50</sup>

The recommendations were revolutionary in their implications that the Committee would become an evaluational and not a reportorial committee, as it had been in the past; that it would respond to the *requests* of the Association and not offer summary reports as it had done; that permanency would be added through a rotating membership; that the Association subsidize the work of the Committee. Omitted, however, was a proposal of a method for the implementation of the recommendations to be made to the Association.

### *Reaction to the recommendations*

Dewey was among the first to welcome the critical report and urged the appointment of a committee who were to find weak spots, not pass around compliments. E. C. Richardson, agreeing with Dewey, made a motion that the recommendation be referred to the incoming Council and the Executive Board and further that a committee, such as the recommendations suggested, be appointed. Meeting no opposition, the motion was approved and transmitted to Council for further action.<sup>51</sup> Again it appeared as if the Association were approving of action whereby it would assume a more forceful role in the evaluation of educational programs.

Council action. Council acted quickly and referred the recommendations to the Committee on By-Laws, which weakened the intent of the recommendations by omitting, in their considerations, references both to length of term of office or service and to payment of committee expenses by the Association. Without encumbering itself financially, the Association adopted the following bylaw:

There shall be a committee of five members on library training, which shall visit each year the several library schools and training classes as far as possible, make a report on the condition and character of the schools and classes which it visits, and present such recommendations as it sees fit.<sup>52</sup>

Significantly omitted were details as to the ways in which the recommendations could be implemented, to the payment of traveling expenses, and to the committee's being able to give or withhold its endorsement of any school or training program.

Executive Board action. The Executive Board appointed the following committee of five to fulfill the requirements of the bylaw: John Cotton Dana, F. M. Crunden, Electra C. Doren, Frank P. Hill, and Eliza G. Browning,<sup>53</sup> but by November 2, 1900, two members had resigned—Crunden and Hill. In their places were appointed William E. Foster and W. H. Brett.<sup>54</sup> In early 1901 the name of Foster was omitted from the list of members and that of Richardson added.<sup>55</sup>

The original appointment of five public librarians intensified a weakness both in the bylaw and in the discrimination of the Executive Board. Apparently no attempt was made to have represented librarians from colleges, universities, or even specialized areas of training such as in children's work. The belated appointment of Richardson to take the place of Foster cannot be regarded as a tribute to the selective discrimination of the Executive Board, for he was a substitute for a substitute. But by such fortuitous procedures was the Committee broadened to include one representative of college and university interests. The achievements of that Committee, with its fluctuating membership, will be noted in a later chapter.

### Report of the Committee on Library Examinations and Credentials, 1900

The long-awaited report of the Committee on Library Examinations and Credentials, appointed by the Executive Board of November 26, 1898, was made at the 1900 Conference. It proved disappointing in that the Committee had been unable to formulate any plans, but instead employed the stratagem of transferring the responsibility which it had assumed to the proposed committee on library instruction.<sup>56</sup> Since the report was accepted without comment and without a recommendation that it be transferred to Council for consideration simultaneously with the recommendations of the Committee on Library Schools, it was apparent that the responsibility for formulating library examinations and credentials would not be assigned to the newly created committee. The bylaw which later created the Committee on Library Training made no reference to the responsibilities, and by that omission transferred to the twentieth century further consideration of the problems resulting from the continuing emergence of varied training programs.

The recognition by the Committee on System of Library Examinations and Credentials that the subject was related to the broader area of education for librarianship would have been more commendable had the Committee itself been functioning throughout the two years following its appointment in 1898. The ineffectual report of 1899 was itself prophetic of the final report, but the question remains as to why a Committee, having as chairman a former president of the American Library Association, Herbert Putnam, who had expressed the hope that the 1898 Conference might answer the question as to what *are* the essentials in a training program, had not accepted the challenge to formulate a system of examinations and credentials.

If the challenge seemed difficult then, it was to become increasingly so throughout the early twentieth century, for within the succeeding decades new training programs were to be developed and the barriers between the trained and the untrained more definable. The failure of the Committee of 1900 was likewise prophetic, for even in the twentieth century the American Library Association was not to be able, even under the capable leadership of C. C. Williamson, to effectuate a program of certification.

## Into the twentieth century: from 1901 to 1905

The nineteenth century transmitted to the twentieth century at least three germinal concepts of standards of library training: (1) library schools should be affiliated with universities; (2) an admission prerequisite should be college graduation; (3) an examining board with clearly defined authority should be created. Yet it was apparent that divisive attitudes on the value of training as well as the type of training were to affect the flourishing of these concepts. The actual situation at the turn of the century offered little encouragement that formal training was considered essential. In a survey of "Library Examinations and Methods of Appointments," formal training was not cited as a prerequisite for appointment in any of the large libraries representative of the entire country.<sup>1</sup> Neither the mood of the 1900 report of the Committee on Library Schools that all forms of training should be encouraged nor the admission that the Committee on System of Library Examinations and Credentials was unable to formulate a comprehensive plan lessened the likelihood of a proliferation or espousals of variant types of training. Nor could the newly created Committee on Library Training, as it was constituted, alleviate the problem.

### COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY TRAINING, 1901-2

Though the American Library Association had established a committee to visit, report upon, and *make recommendations* on the several library schools and training classes, the Committee on Library Training, so created, did not evidence an initiative commensurate with the intent of the bylaw which had established it. The difficulties encountered in the selection of its membership presaged an ineffectual report. The sole contributor to it was E. C. Richardson, a member of the Committee of 1889-90, whose highly personal and informal opinions formed its nucleus.<sup>2</sup> He expressed a hope that the first-year programs might some day achieve a similarity, if not a uniformity, in content and that the second-year programs might be developed into high-character courses sustained in only a few schools. To distinguish between the

levels of instruction he suggested that: (1) the Institute schools, Drexel and Pratt, offer adequate training in library technology in one-year courses; and (2) the New York State Library School and the University of Illinois develop their facilities for the cataloging and knowledge of rare books in all departments.

Concerning advanced training beyond the two-year level, Richardson indicated that he had not formulated any definite opinions. He expressed an interest, however, in the possibility of having university "post-graduate courses in highly scientific bibliographical lines leading to a Ph.D.," wherein paleography might be a major course.

Such were the ideas projected by the Committee. As the views of an individual, they bear some resemblance to those of Josephson; as a report, they were permitted to serve as a substitute for a presumably inactive Committee. The chairman responsible was John Cotton Dana, who had functioned successfully in a similar capacity in 1900 as chairman of the Committee on Library Schools, and whose recommendations had led to the establishment of the Committee on Library Training.

#### The 1902 Committee report

The 1902 report was equally ineffectual. The chairman, Arthur Elmore Bostwick, noted specifically that, since no provisions had been made for payment of traveling expenses, his report would be partial and unsatisfactory. And so it was. The Committee strongly recommended for the future, however, that a definite task be assigned and that an appropriation be granted for its completion.<sup>3</sup> The Executive Board took no action until December 9, 1902, at which time, instead of granting an appropriation, it appointed an entirely new Committee, each member of which was associated with a training program.<sup>4</sup>

#### CRITICISMS AND PROPOSALS FROM OTHER SOURCES

##### From the Round Table on Professional Instruction in Bibliography, 1901

While the American Library Association, through its official agency, the Committee on Library Training, was assuming, with some diffidence, its responsibility of making recommendations, concepts of training were emanating from other sources. One among those sources was the Round Table on Professional Instruction in Bibliography.<sup>5</sup> At its 1901 meeting, Josephson reiterated his proposal, stated in 1896, that a school offering training in bibliographical scholarship be established in connection with a university having a faculty of specialists and an extensive collection of bibliographical literature. He revealed further that he had attempted unsuccessfully to foster the establishment of a school of bibliography in connection, not with a university, but with the Library of Congress, by reporting on his correspondence with Dr. William T. Harris, Commissioner of Education. Harris, while not willing to approve the plan,

complimented Josephson by assuring him that he believed postgraduate courses in bibliography an excellent thing and that one-tenth of the librarians being trained should take such instruction.

W. Stetson Merrill, of the Newberry Library, proposed as a desideratum for library schools the need for lectures by specialists who would present the progress in their fields with special reference to the needs of librarians. Of the library school representatives present who outlined their programs, Miss Katharine Sharp, of the University of Illinois, was the only one to indicate that she called in specialists to perform such a service.

Though the Round Table expressed little interest in Josephson's proposal and strayed far afield in its later discussion, Josephson had outlined, for the first time, his concepts at a meeting of the American Library Association. Neither did the Association then or later manifest approval or disapproval for the plan, which far excelled the current programs in its recognition of the scholarly aspects of librarianship.

#### From representatives of the library schools, 1901-3

Josephson was not alone in his anticipation that schools of the future would be affiliated with universities and would require a college degree for admission. Miss Katharine Sharp, director of the Illinois School, took as her thesis at the 1901 annual meeting of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae that library schools should be graduate schools.<sup>6</sup> With direct candor she stated:

Believing that a baccalaureate degree should be required for admission, I take this occasion to ask your consideration of library schools on a graduate basis.

Her address may be regarded further as the first major recruiting speech, notable for its delivery before a general group rather than librarians. It was made with the skillful appeal that members of the Association urge candidates to seek first an academic degree before pursuing library training.

Mrs. Salome Cutler Fairchild, of the New York State Library School, at a meeting of the District of Columbia Library Association predicted that "the coming library school would be a part of the university, where one or two years would be devoted to professional training and two or three years to the study of special subjects."<sup>7</sup> Neither Miss Sharp nor Mrs. Fairchild took issue with the opinion of the 1900 Committee on Library Schools that no form of training should be discouraged.

Both Melvil Dewey and Mary Wright Plummer offered realistic appraisals: Dewey, in his concern over schools of doubtful value; Miss Plummer, in her contribution to the "Library Training Number" of the *Library Journal* of June, 1901, in her defense of library schools at a meeting of the New York Library Association in 1902, and in her preview of the 1903 report of the Committee on Library Training at the Illinois Library Association.

*Appraisal of Melvil Dewey: schools  
of doubtful value*

Concern over the proliferation of training programs of varying reliability and leadership was expressed emphatically and properly by the pioneer Library School, when Dewey acknowledged in his sixteenth annual report that the difficulties in the field of library instruction were the opening of classes in individual libraries and the proposed schools connected with summer schools or correspondence-teaching institutions. He urged as counteraction that opportunity for good guidance and instruction in short periods be offered and thereby guard against dabblers and charlatans.<sup>8</sup> Dewey had earlier demonstrated his belief that help must be given through summer schools by his efforts to establish a summer program at Chautauqua, the first program being held from July 11 to August 16, 1901. It was specifically designed for librarians, with high school training or its equivalent, who could not leave their work for the extended courses in library schools.<sup>9</sup> This was in contrast to the Amherst Summer School, which was admitting those not holding positions.

Though Dewey had spoken somewhat benevolently, in his annual report, of the "poorest and weakest classes" as being better than none, he was less moderate in his view in "Library Schools of Doubtful Value,"<sup>10</sup> in which he charged "that the cause will be more harmed than helped by the zeal of the unequipt or incompetent." Dewey also attacked the institutions which offered the training, not for intentional impropriety, but for carelessness in permitting instruction by persons "with no established reputation for either skill or wisdom" or who had not completed their own training because of their own lack of fitness.

Alluding somewhat obliquely to the action taken at the Montreal Conference and the establishment of the Committee on Library Training, Dewey warned that

Either an association composed of a few properly equipt schools, or else committees representing the American library association, may have to protect themselves against these pretentious announcements by some form of recognition for instruction that is worthy of the name, so that the public may know whether the courses offered deserve their confidence.<sup>11</sup>

The rebuff to the "unequipt and incompetent" was apparently ignored by those against whose activities it was directed, for, as could be expected, no school identified itself as one of doubtful value.

Schools to which he might have referred. Among the programs to which Dewey might have been referring in 1903 were those of Syracuse University, the University of Chicago, and Columbian University. In contrast to his reticence, the 1903 Committee on Library Training specifically cited not only these schools but the Summer School programs of Amherst and Minnesota for certain inadequacies.<sup>12</sup>

It is possible that Dewey could have been concerned over the University of Texas where, in 1901, it was announced that a course was being

offered "along the lines followed by the leading library schools," but for which no entrance examination was required. It was directed by Benjamin Wyche, a graduate of the University of North Carolina and a former student in the Amherst Summer School. He was assisted by Caroline Wandell, a graduate of the University of Illinois Library School, who added thereby some prestige to the program.<sup>13</sup>

#### *Appraisals of Mary Wright Plummer*

In the *Library Journal*. In 1901 Miss Plummer reaffirmed her belief in the value of training, originally stated in 1891,<sup>14</sup> in her reflections written for the "Library Training Number" of the *Library Journal*.<sup>15</sup> After relating the success of formal training to the early acceptance of the library school graduates by some of the courageous librarians of the time, Miss Plummer attempted to alleviate the anxiety among those without training. She assured them that their fears were not justified "in those cases where assistants were intelligent and ready to adapt themselves to the new demand."

She emphasized the school's responsibility in providing training that would fit one for actual work in libraries, while at the same time she enumerated the objectives as training in principles and the education of the judgment of the individual. Cited as impediments in the fulfillment of the objectives were the tendency of teaching to become crystallized and the failure to make students realize that they were merely learners in school and that they must gain their laurels in actual experience.<sup>16</sup> Since similar warnings had been issued in 1887, before the graduates had been tested, by the Committee on the School of Library Economy, Miss Plummer seemed not to be exploring the problem anew, but merely to be repeating the stereotyped complaints against formal training.

With more perceptiveness she identified the problems in the field which affected formal training: (1) the indiscriminate training and promotion of apprentices; (2) summer school training programs unless attendance were restricted to those holding library positions; (3) the fallacy of setting school training and certain personal qualities against each other as if they were antagonistic; (4) the nineteenth-century concept that library school graduates should serve as unpaid novitiates in libraries after graduation.

In anticipating the future of library training, Miss Plummer enumerated four trends toward: (1) specialization in training, following the rapid increase in the number, size, and kind of libraries; (2) emphasis on subject specialization as a prerequisite or a post-training necessity, since knowledge of cataloging was not adequate preparation for a specialized field; (3) lengthening the course to two or even three years when libraries became aware of their special needs; (4) the establishment of chairs of librarianship in leading universities, where the college student would be able to elect college work to combine with his own course. Like Miss Sharp and Mrs. Fairchild, Miss Plummer anticipated that training would some day be offered within university



environments, but she was not quite so specific about a prerequisite for admission being a college degree.

At the New York Library Association, 1902. Either by choice or by necessity, Miss Plummer assumed the position of defendant for library school training during the 1902 meeting of the New York Library Association. The stimulus for the defense was the somewhat sensational charge made by Mary Eileen Ahern, editor of *Public Libraries*, that many library school students had confessed to her that the requirement for taking the second-year course at the New York State Library School was an attack of nervous prostration.<sup>17</sup> Miss Plummer attempted to refute the charge that schools were demanding too much of their students and, limiting her reference to the Pratt Institute Library School, she assured the group that almost invariably, when a physical breakdown occurred, outside activities, pleasurable or burdensome, were responsible and that school or library work occupied little more than half the student's time and attention.<sup>18</sup>

Having defended the schools from the rumors pertaining to the overworking of students, Miss Plummer offered questions for consideration: the first one, similar to her proposal for revising the training program in 1891, inquired concerning the wisdom of preparing one-year students for the work of small or medium-sized libraries and leaving for the second year the larger problems of administration, classification systems on a comparative basis, difficult cataloging and reference problems, and work in languages. She projected as a corollary the granting of a modified certification for the completion of the one-year program and a more unqualified one for the second-year. Though Miss Plummer invited graduates of the schools to discuss the proposed grading by types of certification, she failed to elicit from potential employers their response to such an implied regulatory system.

To the second question, concerning the withholding of certificates by the school until the student had proved himself successful in practice, Miss Plummer again opposed a view expressed by Miss Ahern. Such a suggestion had been made by Miss Ahern following the report of the Committee on Library Training at the Magnolia Conference of 1902.<sup>19</sup> Miss Plummer objected to it because of the danger of misplacement and consequent failure of a student so misplaced. Instead she felt that practice work in the library school offered the faculty a better opportunity for estimating capabilities of the students.

To the third question, "Are the schools admitting students in too great numbers?" Miss Plummer felt that economically, possibly not; but from the point of view of the student, yes. She offered as an alternative the establishment in strategically located areas—the northwest, the southwest, the Pacific coast, the middle west, and the south—of library schools, "*carrying on the traditions of the present ones by a kind of apostolic succession.*" (Italics mine.) After issuing an open invitation for the formation of schools according to established tradition, Miss Plummer posed a final question, which partook of Dewey's concern over schools of doubtful value:

Is there anything that librarians as a body—either in their state or national association—can do to save

1. Young persons of ability from choosing, in their ignorance of the field, inferior sources of so-called library training?
2. Librarians and library boards from being imposed upon by letters and certificates from such sources?
3. And, if there is anything that can be done, have or have not librarians a duty in the matter?<sup>20</sup>

The librarians evidenced concern over the multiplication of library schools, some of which they regarded, but did not identify, as quack schools. Following a plan undertaken by the Western Library Meeting, which had appointed a committee to identify forthrightly the schools that were disapproved of,<sup>21</sup> the New York State Library Association appointed a committee "to inspect and report at the next meeting of the Association upon the newer and smaller schools and upon the work of the summer schools."<sup>22</sup> The appointment of the committees by state groups was an assertion by librarians that they recognized it as their duty to inform prospective students and employers about inferior programs. In contrast to the membership of the Committee on Library Training of 1903, representative of training programs only, the New York committee was composed of practicing librarians and a trustee. Though the Western committee presumably never reported, both the state committees were reprimanded by *Public Libraries* for not approaching the problem vigorously.<sup>23</sup> One year later, the New York committee fulfilled its obligation, by endorsing in general rather than differing from the views of the Committee on Library Training.

At the Illinois Library Association, 1903. Miss Plummer continued to be a representative at large of the library schools, for again in 1903 she envisioned the triumph of formal library school training over any other kind in her speech, "The Pros and Cons of Training for Librarianship,"<sup>24</sup> at a meeting of the Illinois Library Association. From the point of view of originality, her speech did not deserve the accolade of *Public Libraries* that "nothing better or finer has ever been written on the subject of library training."<sup>25</sup> Repetitive of her earlier thoughts, it was almost surfeited with concern over the lowering of the level of librarianship by misguided training efforts; and it repeated, without new perspective, her own concept that there should be an independent one-year course, followed by an advanced second-year course, to fit one for a "higher grade of library."

Nevertheless it was also, in part, an informal but inspirational prelude to the report of the Committee on Library Training; as such, it revealed a criterion, only previously hinted at, that new training programs "should have at least one school-trained instructor to continue the best traditions of the schools, and to make use of their accumulated experience." By such means would Miss Plummer, and presumably the Committee, have insured her principle of apostolic succession.

In the accompanying analysis of the 1903 report of the Committee

on Library Training, it will be discernible readily which of the schools might have been identified as "apostolic," had that particular word been used to characterize the schools conforming to the pattern of training as outlined in the report.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY TRAINING, 1903

The members of the Committee on Library Training for 1903, appointed by the Executive Board, represented six library training programs, one of which—that at Simmons College in Boston—had been established for only a few months at the time of its recognition by the Board. The members were: Mary Wright Plummer, of Pratt; Salome Cutler Fairchild, of New York State Library School; Katharine L. Sharp, of Illinois; Alice B. Kroeger, of Drexel; and Mary E. Robbins, of Simmons. To the Committee, Edwin H. Anderson, representing the Training School for Children's Librarians, was appointed somewhat informally.<sup>26</sup>

The inclusion of Miss Robbins as a member was a vote of confidence extended to the library school course included in the curriculum of Simmons College, which was begun in the school year, 1902-3.<sup>27</sup> The ready acceptance of the Simmons program was more directly attributable to the fact that Miss Robbins, like the representatives of all the programs, except that of the New York State Library School, was a graduate of that School.

It is possible that by the appointments of Committee members associated with library schools, the Executive Board, through indirection, considered that the recommendation concerning an appropriation for travel expenses had been met. Such appointments were anomalous, however, for whatever the qualifications of the members, they were, according to the bylaw, to *make recommendations*, presumably for the improvement of the library schools and training programs. They were, in effect, to report on programs with which they were associated and to present recommendations which only they themselves could implement within their own schools.

The members were aware of their untenable position, for as a pre-  
amble to the 1903 report<sup>28</sup> the following apologia appeared:

This committee, while sensible that it might have been composed of persons less likely to be thought prejudiced, did not feel at liberty to decline the task assigned to it or to give less than its very best thought and effort to the work. It conceived its task to be, not the expression of the individual or collective opinions of its members on the subject of library training, but a careful investigation of all discoverable sources and a clear presentation of the conditions thus brought to light.

Having accepted its task, the Committee prepared questionnaires<sup>29</sup> for six kinds of library training programs: (1) schools offering winter courses, both the one- and two-year programs; (2) summer school or

summer programs; (3) apprentice classes in libraries; (4) colleges offering courses in bibliography and the history of printing; (5) normal schools giving courses in library economy; (6) schools and individuals conducting correspondence courses. In the accompanying analysis, the Committee's findings on schools offering winter courses and summer schools or summer programs will be detailed. Decisions concerning only the other kinds of programs will be included since they are peripheral to the concept of formal training for library work.

### Schools offering winter courses<sup>30</sup>

The programs of nine schools were examined: the New York State Library School, the Library School of Pratt Institute, the Library School of Drexel Institute, the Library School of the University of Illinois, the School of Library Science of Columbian University, the Department of Library Science of Chicago University, the Course in Library Economics of Syracuse University, the School for the Training of Children's Librarians of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, and the Course in Library Science of Simmons College. Specific facts, concerning (1) the faculty, (2) entrance requirements, (3) length of course and credentials, (4) curriculum, and (5) practice work, revealed the lack of uniformity among the schools and the consequent need for a redirection of the programs either toward a comparable training level or toward a graded training level.

#### *The faculty*

The library school training of the faculty was regarded as significant in the consideration of qualifications. The Committee was guided by the assumption that the instruction *should* be satisfactory because the instructors, doubtless recommended by the established<sup>31</sup> schools, would be continuing in their tradition and making use of the accumulated teaching experiences.

The Committee concluded that the faculty appeared, in general, well qualified since the majority had been trained in one or the other of the established schools. Three schools failed to have faculty members with library school training: (1) Syracuse University, where the instructors were without training or experience in any other library; (2) the Columbian University, where one of the four instructors was a one-year student from the New York State Library School and the others lacked any training; (3) Chicago University, where the only instructor was without training.

As to number of instructors, none of the schools, according to the report, had fewer than four members except Simmons College, where the program was still tentative, and Chicago University, with only one. Syracuse should have been cited also because it had only two.

#### *Entrance requirements*

The entrance requirements ranged from the prerequisite of a

college degree, effective March 1, 1902, at the New York State Library School, to the requirement of Columbian University, which was "good intelligence." There was no indication as to how that trait could be measured. The following summary of schools indicates the range of their entrance requirements:

New York State Library School, College degree  
 University of Illinois, Three years of college (decision made December 9, 1902)  
 Chicago University, Two years of college within the last two years (formerly: ability to enter the freshman class)  
 Carnegie Training School, Examination or a college diploma in lieu of  
 Pratt Institute, Examination  
 Drexel Institute, Examination  
 Simmons College, [Not cited in report; high school graduation or its equivalent]  
 Syracuse University, High school diploma or a blank filled out by a high school principal  
 Columbian University, Good intelligence

The Committee, in its appraisal, though not wanting to recommend uniformity of entrance requirements, stated that it felt that Chicago University, Columbian University, and the University of Syracuse fell short of the standard by not requiring at least three years of college training or a comprehensive examination.

### *Length of course and credentials*

No course was planned for more than two years, but it was possible for graduates of different schools to hold certificates representing entirely different achievements. For example, a certificate from the New York State Library School implied one year of training; from Syracuse, two years of training; from Pratt, either one or two years. At Pratt, the student could receive a diploma after two years if he passed certain examinations; if not, he received a certificate.

Both Pratt and Drexel offered certificates for one year; Carnegie Training School gave a certificate for one year and a diploma for two years. In some instances Carnegie awarded special certificates for a special one-year course given to those with experience. Certificates were also granted by Chicago, Columbian, and Syracuse universities.

The New York State Library School awarded either a diploma or a degree for the second year; the degree was awarded to those entering with college degrees. Illinois awarded the degree of B.L.S. for two years of university work and two years of library school, but as of 1904 the plan was to change: a B.A. degree would be awarded for three years of university work in addition to the first year of the library school course and a B.L.S. for three years of university work in addition to the two years of the library school course.

*Curriculum*

The Committee encountered its greatest difficulty, as had earlier committees, when it attempted to study the curricula of the various schools. Convinced that the confusion of terminology indicated a confusion of ideas, the Committee stated that "a general revision of the scheme of nomenclature of subjects taught should be made by the various schools faculties in consultation." Terms noted as requiring definition were: library administration, book arts, bibliography, practice work, library extension, and reading-room work.

Few electives were included in the curricula. The New York State Library School offered electives in any one of the subjects taught; Illinois, in the first semester, offered a choice among advanced reference work, public documents, and bookmaking, and, in the second semester, permitted a choice between public documents and bookmaking. The entire second-year program at Pratt was regarded as an elective, as it was independent of the first year.

Both Chicago and Columbian universities were reprimanded for allowing only a part of the course to be taken because of the possibility of ultimate misrepresentation or misunderstanding on the part of the student or the employer.

*Practice work*

The schools varied considerably as to the amount of time allocated for practice work, but, despite the variations, the Committee felt that the information "should dispose once and forever of the often-repeated charge that the established schools give only theory and instruction and no practical work." The time, which can not be equated, spent on practice work varied as follows:

New York State Library School, 90 hours in junior year; 200 in senior year

Illinois University, 260 hours in junior year; 330 in senior year

Pratt Institute, 468 hours in junior year; 132 in senior year (Pratt's proposal to offer 84 hours at the beginning of the first term would raise the 468 to 552 hours)

Drexel Institute, 60 hours in junior year; 180 in senior year (approx.)

Chicago University, Two years' apprentice work in the University library

Simmons College, College library in charge of the library school but apprentice work done elsewhere

Columbian University, Opportunities for cataloging

Syracuse University, Six hours weekly for juniors; 25 hours weekly for seniors

Carnegie Training School, One-half of the school year

*Summary of criticisms*

Of the nine schools, only three were criticized by the Committee for their failure to achieve a desirable standard. Chicago University

was reprimanded for its low entrance requirement, for allowing only a part of the course to be taken, and for employing an instructor without library school training. Columbian University was questioned as to the meaning of its entrance requirement of "good intelligence" and for permitting only part of the course to be taken; Syracuse University, for offering instruction by a faculty without library school training or experience in any other library.

Since no specific criticisms were leveled at the other schools, it can be assumed that as of 1903 the following schools were found acceptable: the New York State Library School, the University of Illinois Library School, Pratt Institute, Drexel Institute, the Simmons College program, and the Training School for Children's Librarians at the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. Though they were the six schools represented by the membership of the Committee, there was an acknowledgment by the Committee that it represented library schools

which are by no means satisfied with their own standards or with their own qualifications for criticism, but which are earnestly endeavoring to introduce better and higher standards as fast as these are recognized.

### Summer schools<sup>32</sup>

Nine summer schools responded to the questionnaire; they were the summer schools of the Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin State Library Commissions; the New York State Library School; and that of the Chautauqua Institution, California University, the State University of Missouri, and the Amherst Summer Library School.

From the context of the report, it appeared that the Committee on Library Training had established two criteria against which the summer programs were measured: (1) the admission of only those holding paid positions or under definite appointment; (2) the offering of practice work in small libraries. The Committee did not commit itself on entrance requirements, but simply noted that all the programs claimed to require a high school education or its equivalent and that none gave an examination.

Only two programs were specifically cited as failing to reach the standards attained by the majority—Amherst and Minnesota—but all were notified that they had been remiss in failing to examine those candidates who were not actually librarians or paid assistants or under definite appointment and in failing to provide an opportunity for practice work in small public libraries. The Amherst program was scored on four counts: (1) for admitting entirely inexperienced persons without limit as to number; (2) for offering to inexperienced persons inadequate practical instruction in too few lines; (3) for attempting the work of preparation, instruction, and revision with only one instructor and fifty students; (4) for not using an entrance examination or a final test and for giving credentials without experience.

The Minnesota Summer School was referred to specifically for its

policy of admitting inexperienced persons without limit as to number and for giving credentials in a pattern similar to that of Amherst.

Only one of the schools viewed its program with dissatisfaction, that being the University of California, which informed the Committee that the summer program would not be offered again because "six weeks is too short a time for crude material and there is not demand enough from library assistants."

#### Decisions concerning other kinds of programs<sup>33</sup>

The Committee made as thorough an investigation as was possible on the basis of the returns of the questionnaires and offered the following decisions:

##### *Apprentice classes*

Twenty-three libraries out of thirty-three submitted data on their apprentice programs, which attempted to prepare students for work in other libraries. Having viewed the varying entrance requirements, course content, and instructional methods, the Committee expressed concern over the development of such programs. While acknowledging that it did not question the methods of those libraries training apprentices for their own staff, the Committee warned of the harm that could be done by a library

that takes in persons not engaged in library work and not under appointment, without any test of their general knowledge by examination, uses them for its own needs only (requiring no fee from them and hence not responsible to them), and at the end of six months or so sends them out with a letter to seek positions in other libraries.

##### *College courses in bibliography*

Eleven colleges responded to the questionnaire. The Committee, after noting the lack of uniformity in the object, the subjects of instruction, and the persons to whom the courses were directed, recommended that further consideration be given to the problem by the College Library Section as the appropriate body for such consideration.

##### *Normal school courses in library economy*

Ten normal schools responded to the questionnaire, nine of which were in Illinois and Wisconsin. Five programs were being directed by library school graduates and two by summer school students. Though the instruction was directed toward persons preparing to teach, the Committee felt that the preparation should be similar to that required for the librarian of the small library. The need for systematization of the normal school training of teachers was dismissed as not "within the scope of the American Library Association," and the Committee recommended that the problem be brought "to the consideration of the Library Section of the National Education Association."



By dismissing the responsibility, the Committee failed to anticipate the impact of an emerging school library program and to realize that school library training might be regarded as an area for specialization in the regular library school or as indicative of the need for a new type of library school.

### *Correspondence courses*

Indicating its grave concern over correspondence courses, the Committee allotted a generous proportion of the report to the subject, in spite of the fact that at that time only one institution and two private individuals, unidentified, were engaged in the work. The Committee viewed with disfavor correspondence courses as taught by individuals, since they could not be supervised, regulated, or controlled and since they could be carried on without responsibility to an authoritative body.

With that conviction, the Committee recommended that some of the library schools and some of the leading libraries be authorized by *the Association* to plan correspondence programs.

### Final recommendations

The Committee, before asking to be discharged, offered two recommendations, which they felt would be instrumental in improving the standards of training, in aiding library boards to discriminate among the variously advertised training sources, and in guiding applicants "who should not be allowed to waste time, effort, and money on an inferior quality or defective quantity of training."

The recommendations made to implement the report were:

1. That another and a standing Committee on Library Training be appointed, to be composed of eight persons: one, a member of a state library commission; one, the librarian of a free circulating library of, at least, 50,000 volumes; one, the librarian of a college or reference library; one library trustee, interested in questions of training; and four library school graduates engaged in library work in various kinds of libraries and in various capacities, including one from the faculty of a library school. One school graduate and one other member to be retired and replaced at the end of the first two years and each year thereafter.

That this committee be required to present an annual report to the American Library Association. That this report be discussed each year and not accepted as a matter of routine.

2. That there be published an A.L.A. tract on "Training for Librarianship," making a brief statement of a wholly satisfactory standard for each type of school, to which shall be appended the names of such sources of training of different kinds and grades as fully meet this standard, this statement and list of schools registered as fully meeting the standard to be revised for the annual report each year.

*Reaction of the Association*

Though the Committee had requested that it be discharged, the Association asked instead that the Committee "formulate a statement of the standards to be required of the various library schools" before its dissolution.<sup>34</sup> The unexpected assignment necessitated a continuation of the Committee,<sup>35</sup> which found itself involved for the next two years in a search for standards.

Council action. Meanwhile Council took no action on the two recommendations, presumably awaiting the report on standards. For its failure Council was criticized by the *Library Journal*, because of the report's being regarded as "practically the last word on conditions of library training as they exist at the present time."<sup>36</sup> Much less concern was expressed for recommendation one, which would have involved a change in the bylaws, than for recommendation two, which called for a pamphlet on library training. The *Library Journal*, nevertheless, urged publication of such a pamphlet as a service to library interests and as an encouragement to the Committee for its excellent contribution.

*Reactions of the schools criticized*

From the schools which had been commended there was, as to be expected, no comment since a representative of each school had served on the Committee. Of the three schools criticized, however, Syracuse University responded openly. The rebuttal,<sup>37</sup> offered by Mary J. Sibley (Mrs. H. O. Sibley), bluntly stated that the Committee had found "certain failures to reach a desirable standard," only in the three nonrepresented schools, and she summarized the implied charges against Syracuse as being that the school,

with a low standard of admission, incompetent teachers, a pretentious curriculum, imperfect facilities, and primitive methods, attempts to do the work of a library school.

In boldly defending Dr. H. O. Sibley, the professor of library economy, against the charge of incompetency, she enumerated his credentials, which were that he had a Ph.D. degree, had written a Latin thesis, had been a librarian for fourteen years, and had spent eight years perfecting a bibliographic course in literature designed especially for library classes. Having cited his qualifications, Mrs. Sibley asked somewhat tauntingly, "Pray, what has this broad scholar, this experienced teacher, to learn from a library school about teaching his subject?"

Praising the course, which was teaching the best modern methods, the greatly improved facilities, the expert supervision given to the students, Mrs. Sibley assured the library world that

if the course at Syracuse continues to increase at the present rate, additional teachers may be required; but not because of the incompetency or failure in duty of those now in charge.

From Columbian University. Despite the adverse criticisms, or possibly because of them, Columbian University made plans for continuing

and improving its program. In early 1904, publicity appeared that the establishment of a department of graduate study in bibliography and library science was being contemplated.<sup>38</sup> Momentarily it seemed as if Josephson's concept of training<sup>39</sup> would be furthered by the plans, which would fit students "for service in libraries affording special facilities and equipment for reference and research." However, by October, 1904, an announcement appeared that the program had been discontinued.<sup>40</sup> Since the reason given for the discontinuance of the school was the "difficulty experienced in securing the proper faculty," a ready conclusion could be reached that Columbian University had heeded the Committee report of 1903. Such a relationship could only have been accidental, since the major reason given for not continuing the program was the departure from Washington of W. P. Cutter, the director of the program. Whatever the circumstances, one of the schools, deemed less than satisfactory in its standards, was abolished.

From the University of Chicago. The University of Chicago offered no justification for its program through the pages of the *Library Journal* or *Public Libraries*, but since no further reference was made to the library science courses in the annual reports of the president after 1904, it would appear that the program was not continued. In 1910, Miss Plummer, who served as chairman of the 1903 Committee on Library Training, attributed the decision to give up the course at Chicago to the impact of the 1903 report.<sup>41</sup> Other than for her comment, no other reference was made to the program.

#### ENDORSEMENT OF THE 1903 REPORT BY THE NEW YORK LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

The Committee which had been created in 1902 to make a critical review of training agencies offered, instead of its own, a summary of the 1903 report of the Committee on Library Training.<sup>42</sup> Praising the report for being "so complete, so clear, so exhaustive, and withal so judicial and impartial," the New York Committee seconded the endorsement of the programs of both the New York State Library School and that of Pratt Institute. Similarly, the New York Committee questioned the program at Syracuse University by referring specifically to the absence of instructors with professional education or practical experience outside the work of that school, to its faculty of two, and to the absence of "systematic training or expert supervision." The Committee urged that Syracuse "impose more rigid entrance requirements and be careful thoroughly to test the proficiency of students before conferring degrees, certificates or diplomas."

Recognizing the needs of the state of New York, the Committee proposed, as something practical and applicable to the situation, the establishment in some of the larger libraries of a modification of the apprentice class method of instruction outlined in the report. The modification was to be accomplished by bringing to the libraries the instructors from the library schools and the persons desirous of training. The

Committee was presumably describing what might have been called an extension teaching program, for which the library schools would be responsible but for which neither a degree nor a diploma would be conferred.

#### An alternate proposal: a program for men

Though the Committee had offered a practical solution to the immediate needs of the libraries, an alternative proposal was made by H. L. Elmendorf that a shortened, standard course was required "especially for men who did not need, and were not willing to undergo, two years' instruction in library methods, which after all were neither particularly abstruse or difficult."<sup>43</sup> Dewey disagreed on the length of the course, saying that the thought was to lengthen rather than to shorten the course and he reinforced his argument with references to professional training in other fields.

In contrast to Dewey, who had failed to recognize the significance of the statement regarding the need of a shortened course for men, or perhaps had ignored it, Elmendorf focused attention on a situation which had been developing since the first formal training program had been established. In that first class, scheduled for three months originally, only three men enrolled. During the intervening years, the various library school programs continued to fail to attract male students.

#### Continuing substantiation

Whereas Dewey had ignored the implication, the *Library Journal* directly acknowledged the problem. Admitting that men "with good equipment, alert minds and literary tastes" did not find the library school essential to their success in the profession, the *Journal* felt that a groundwork of technical knowledge was needed by those entering the profession. Two reasons were cited as contributory to the failure of the schools to attract men: the predominance of women in the schools and the emphasis upon small details.<sup>44</sup>

Though by 1903 the issue had received discussion and publicity, Williamson was still to reach two similar conclusions in his report of 1923: (1) of the total number of graduates of all the schools included in his report—approximately 5,000—only 276, or between 5 and 6 per cent, were male students;<sup>45</sup> (2) the predominance of women in the faculty and in the student body tended to lower the prestige of library schools when compared to that of other professional schools.<sup>46</sup> Few changes were to occur during the twenty-year period which could alter the trend manifested since 1887.

#### CRITICISMS OF LIBRARY SCHOOLS, 1903

In contrast to the conclusion of the 1903 Committee that "the quality of the instruction *should* be satisfactory," from two sources came

evidence offering contradictory appraisals, from former students and from William Warner Bishop, in a review of a thesis prepared by Frances Simpson, an instructor at the University of Illinois Library School.

### From former students

Mary Eileen Ahern, editor of *Public Libraries*, documented to some extent the complaints, which she had repeated at the meeting of the New York Library Association, when she offered to publicize a student's views on library schools. The impetus for the publicity had been the discussion of the report on library schools, which Miss Ahern felt should be full and free. She proposed to include the letter from a student on the basis that

What is really good and true in the work of the schools cannot be hurt by criticism, and if students feel they have room for complaint, it is better for both sides to have a chance to say so frankly and to say so in the open, so that the free winds of discussion may blow away the chaff in the complaint, than to allow a grievance, real or imaginary, to remain.<sup>47</sup>

The letter, when released, was a blanket indictment, without substantiation of charges or identification of writer. It was hazy and vague in its veiled and captious implications that something was amiss, first, in the administration and indeed the ethical standards of the schools and, secondly, in the qualifications of the faculty. A final devastating reference to the lack of personal integrity was the student's assumption that once the director of a school had formed an opinion of a student, the subordinate members of the faculty seldom failed to concur because they were working for bread.<sup>48</sup>

The letter from the library school student might well have been regarded as the unrestrained outpourings of a harassed individual who had apparently not found his experience a rewarding one, had not, within eight months, another letter appeared in *Public Libraries*. The second letter, signed "One Who Knows," not only proclaimed its agreement with the content of the July letter but further declared that the letter "could be circulated as a statement of sentiments and receive the signature of eight-tenths of the library school graduates."<sup>49</sup>

To such criticisms, the faculties of the library schools remained noncommittal; neither from individuals nor from schools were responses forthcoming in the literature.

### From William Warner Bishop

When, in 1903, Frances Simpson presented a thesis to the University of Illinois Library School, she had, at that time, been an instructor in the School for two years. The School expressed pleasure over the appearance of the thesis as furnishing a textbook for the class in the

history of libraries, a course being taught by Miss Simpson, and expressed a hope that other library schools might find it useful.<sup>50</sup>

Such an opinion as to the value of the thesis was not held by William Warner Bishop, who stated as his assumption that the "University of Illinois is of too high rank to permit us to expect any other than first class work from its teaching force." His examination of the thesis, a *Syllabus for a Course of Study in the History of the Evolution of the Library in Europe and America*,<sup>51</sup> led him to say that it revealed a lack of historical perspective, a want of acquaintance with the sources of historical knowledge, factual inaccuracies, and an indifference to the demands of syntax and style.

Exploring the implication of his own evaluation, Bishop concluded that "the work offered in this subject can hardly be held to be of university grade." He advised the library schools further that, though their avowed intent appeared to be ultimately the requirement of a college degree as a *sine qua non* of entrance, such a requirement alone would not secure the desirable college graduates. He warned also that no amount of proficiency in mechanical details could secure the respect of the graduate student unless it were coupled with unusual scholarship and teaching experience. Bishop's appraisal was an unofficial supplement to the report of the Committee on Library Training, which had not studied the thoroughness or the quality of instruction. Instead, the Committee acknowledged that only hearsay evidence had been offered by those complaining of the unsatisfactory quality. Bishop had ventured to offer documented evidence.

Williamson reached a similar conclusion in his survey of the teaching staffs in twelve library schools. Of them he wrote:

A detailed analysis of the training and experience of members . . . seems to indicate a quite definite lack of fitness of a large proportion of them for giving instruction of high professional character to students with college or university education.<sup>52</sup>

Little noted amidst the criticisms of the year 1903 was the entry of Andrew Carnegie into the field of library training. He had not, since 1890, made any reference to the training programs, but the year 1903 marked a reversal of the opinion which he had expressed to Melvil Dewey.<sup>53</sup>

#### CARNEGIE'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO LIBRARY TRAINING

##### To Western Reserve University, 1903

Thirteen years after Carnegie had refused to provide financial assistance to the New York State Library School, Charles F. Thwing, president of Western Reserve University, announced, on February 23, 1903, that Carnegie had made an endowment of \$100,000 to aid in the educational program for librarians to be offered at Western Reserve.<sup>54</sup> The *Library Journal* proclaimed the endowment the most important

event of the year in the library field, since only by developing better programs could the superficial and inadequate programs be limited.<sup>55</sup> The *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, in commenting on the gift, editorialized:

It is doubtful whether Mr. Carnegie, with all his gifts for libraries, has ever devoted the same amount of money to such a useful end. In providing ultimately for a trained force of men and women to administer these libraries he has supplied a want of his own creation.<sup>56</sup>

In thus appraising the endowment, the *Plain Dealer* repeated knowingly or unknowingly the reason advanced by Melvil Dewey in 1890, which had gone unheeded.

#### *Background data on the establishment of the Library School*

The initiative for the establishment of a training program of some type in Ohio had been taken as early as 1900 by the Ohio Library Association. At its meeting of October 3-5, 1900, a detailed survey of what had been done in the state and a review of needs were presented by the Ohio Committee on Library Training.<sup>57</sup> The Committee, composed of Electra C. Doren and W. H. Brett, presented a report showing that every type had been considered: the Dayton Public Library Training Program, 1896-98; lectures at the Cleveland Public Library summer program; and pupil-assistant training at Ohio State University, Oberlin College, and Western Reserve University. The Committee further noted that Ohio had through the years employed twenty-six graduates of the library schools of New York, Illinois, and Pratt.

Though expressing gratification over the appreciation of training in the state, the Committee recommended a course in one of the regular library schools. It frankly evaluated summer schools as inadequate and regarded correspondence work as unfeasible unless there were available equipment and a faculty equal to that of the regular library schools.

A more positive step was taken by Brett, who, increasingly concerned over the need for trained personnel in the Cleveland Public Library, became convinced that the need could best be met by the establishment of a library school within the state.<sup>58</sup> He approached President Thwing of Western Reserve concerning the establishment of a library school at the University, and later a committee prepared an estimated budget for conducting such a school and detailed the needs of physical equipment. The committee further suggested that the admission requirements and length of course be equal to those of the Albany School, but, in addition, it enumerated four specific ways wherein the program would differ from that at Albany.<sup>59</sup>

The work of the committee was successful in that its report was received favorably by the Trustees of Western Reserve University, who delegated to the President the task of securing the necessary funds. It was a task which he fulfilled with distinction, for Thwing was able to convince Andrew Carnegie that the establishment of the Library School

was an imperative need. Carnegie, in response to Thwing's personal intercession, sent "bonds of the American Tobacco Company in an amount sufficient to yield an annual income of some \$5,000,"<sup>60</sup> as an endowment for the School.

### To public library training programs

Having endowed the Western Reserve University Library School, Carnegie offered assistance to the training program being conducted at the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, the Training School for Children's Librarians. Presumably the idea was Carnegie's own, for the Board of Trustees of the Library stated in the annual report that Carnegie had asked that he be permitted to contribute \$5,000 yearly for the ensuing three years toward the maintenance of the School.<sup>61</sup> A modest statement was made in the *Library Journal*, before the appearance of the annual report, that the gift had been accepted on April 21, 1903.<sup>62</sup> As far as the annual reports reveal, no crisis had arisen which necessitated such an offer; it appears in large part to be, therefore, another tribute to Pittsburgh from Carnegie. The financial aid was continued until 1916, at which time the School became a department of the Carnegie Institute. At that time the name of the School was changed officially to the Carnegie Library School and continued to receive a yearly budgetary allotment from the Institute.<sup>63</sup>

Carnegie's third grant to a library training program was the result of an appeal from the Carnegie Library of Atlanta, which had sought his aid in desperation over the continuing loss of its staff to other Carnegie libraries being erected or wanting to improve their services. Anne Wallace, the librarian, appealed personally to Carnegie, who responded by making a gift of \$4,000 yearly for three years and intimated further that if the program were successful an annual grant would be made.<sup>64</sup> The announcement of the gift was made on April 13, 1905, almost two years after the announcement of the gift to the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh.

In 1911 Carnegie made a contribution to a fourth library training program, that of the New York Public Library.<sup>65</sup> In assisting those programs, Carnegie had obscured the philosophical basis of his benefactions, which assumed

that the city, county and state library authorities, and if not they, the librarian's profession might well take the initiative and to some extent the burden of providing adequate facilities for training librarians.<sup>66</sup>

Having thus become involved with training programs, it was to be only a matter of time until the Carnegie Corporation, besieged by requests for further grants, was to be forced to inquire into the training situation. Since the matter was a Corporation problem, not to be explored fully until after 1918,<sup>67</sup> it was not to affect significantly the pattern of training until the report of Williamson had been made and presented.



Because the Corporation's problem was peripheral to the developments which ensued between 1903 and 1923, only those pertinent aspects will be included in this examination of training. The absence of any special reference to Carnegie's contributions from the contemporary reports of the Committee on Library Training tends further to isolate the donations as peripheral to the training problems.

## In pursuit of library training standards, 1905-6

### ASSOCIATION RESTRICTIONS CONCERNING TRAINING

The specific assignment by the Association to the Committee on Library Training to formulate standards implied, or tended to imply, the assumption of Association authority in regard to the possible application of those standards. It must be recalled, however, that since the bylaw establishing the Committee had omitted any reference to procedures whereby recommendations were to be implemented, and also to any acceptance of financial responsibility for the Committee, the Association had not pledged its full support on behalf of the Committee.

Further evidence of the reluctance of the Association to accept leadership can be found in the report of the Committee on Permanent Headquarters, presented in 1904. In defining the functions of the Association, that Committee made a statement that it did *"not think it advisable for the Association to undertake the examination of candidates for library positions, or to issue certificates of qualifications."*<sup>1</sup> (Italics mine.) The inclusion of such a statement might have been a belated response to the report of the Committee on System of Library Examinations and Credentials, made in 1900, that the question be further considered; or it might have been to forewarn the Committee on Library Training that the Association would not assume any responsibility for examining or certifying by any standards that might be devised. If the latter, the action was a betrayal of the intent, if not the manifest content, of the bylaw which established the Committee, since recommendations made without power of enforcement are suggestive only.

Another restrictive decision, relating to the establishment of an A.L.A. Library School, could not have been made for the benefit of the Committee on Library Training. Nevertheless, in delimiting the functions, the Committee on Permanent Headquarters agreed unanimously that *"it is not desirable to organize a library school for which the American Library Association would be responsible."*<sup>2</sup> (Italics mine.) The cryptic statement, acknowledging that the Committee had given consideration to such a proposal, provided no clues as to the source of the suggestion. It is possible that it was in response to some proposals presented by Dewey in his plans for a National Library Institute.

### Dewey's plan for a National Library Institute

Dewey had proposed in January, 1904, the establishment of a National Library Institute as an independent corporation in New York.<sup>3</sup> The functions as outlined were similar to those later advanced by the Committee on Permanent Headquarters except that Dewey had added:

"The Institute should include the distinctly national library school with full and summer courses, and also instruction by correspondence, institutes, and addresses."

How different the educational pattern would have been if serious attention had been given to the establishment of a national library school in conjunction with the establishment of a permanent headquarters for the American Library Association could be only conjectural; what is not conjectural but identifiable was the passive interest, both in educational problems and in the development of a certification program, implied by the absence of discussion of any of the restrictions cited by the Committee on Permanent Headquarters. Though a committee was appointed to study further the question of a permanent headquarters, no reference was made to the need for a review of the functions as outlined by the Committee.

### REPORT ON STANDARDS OF LIBRARY TRAINING, 1905

The Committee on Library Training made no reference to a national library school under the sponsorship of the American Library Association, to the examination of students, or to a national certification program as it pursued its task of formulating standards for the various types of training. The two years' delay in the presentation of the standards represented a search for, but not the achievement of, unanimous recommendations concerning standards for the established winter schools, summer schools, apprentice classes, and correspondence courses. The Committee, obliged to do its work by correspondence rather than in conference, had not, at the end of two years, refined its differences so that definite criteria could be stated. Mary Wright Plummer, the continuing chairman, had succeeded in securing, by the time of the Portland Conference of 1905, the variant opinions of the members of certain standards which she offered as "desirable" but by no means to be considered the final standards.

Though the report bears the names of the original six members of the Committee, Edwin H. Anderson had resigned as librarian of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh;<sup>4</sup> therefore, in some instances, the report reflects the opinions of five rather than of six members. It is not always clear, however, just when five are being referred to and when six, when a unanimous vote was recorded. The accompanying outline is based on data contained in paragraph form in the official 1905 Report of the Committee on Library Training.<sup>5</sup> Information is given, when

possible, on: (1) entrance requirements; (2) instruction; (3) tests and credentials; (4) minimum number and list of subjects for which certificate or diploma should be given.

The lack of unanimity was particularly apparent in regard to the entrance requirements for the winter schools. Of the lack, the Committee acknowledged that it revealed two things: (1) that the library schools themselves were not certain as to the necessary foundations of their work; (2) that some further thought should be given to the subject. Having fulfilled, even though imperfectly, its assignment, the Committee requested again that it be discharged and called attention to the recommendation made in 1903 that a standing committee of eight be appointed, "selected from specified fields of library work, to report regularly each year on all known sources of library training."

### 1905 STANDARDS OF LIBRARY TRAINING FOR LIBRARY SCHOOLS

Established winter schools	Summer schools
<p><i>Entrance requirements</i></p> <p>No opinion (1) <sup>a</sup></p> <p>3 years of college (2)</p> <p>2 years of college (3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>Entrance examination in lieu of college requirement (5)</p> <p>Personal fitness for library work (5); to be ascertained by trial (1)</p> <p><i>Instruction—the instructors</i></p> <p>1. One third trained in a recognized library school; two thirds have practical experience in library work or wide academic training (1)</p> <p>2. One third have experience in libraries other than that connected with the school</p> <p>3. One half give their entire time to the school (1)</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">One third give their entire time to the school (1)</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Instructors should have regular library duties (2)</p>	<p>Applicant hold a paid position as librarian or library assistant, or a definite written appointment to a library position</p> <p>Completion of high school or its equivalent (2)</p> <p>One person trained in a library school (2)</p> <p>Two persons have experience in libraries other than that connected with the school (2)</p>

<sup>a</sup> Number in parentheses indicates number of members approving the statement; no number indicates unanimity.

Instructors should keep in close touch with practice library work (1)

4. One instructor for every ten students for laboratory work (1)

*In actual library work*

One sixth of the student's time in the library connected with the school, or in some place where it can be supervised by the school (3)

*Test and credentials*

Certificate or diploma be given at the end of the course, certifying only to the satisfactory completion of the course and fulfillment of tests; not to fitness for library work, which should be a question referred to the school in the individual case, for recommendation—(3) convinced of the necessity of this caution; (2) thought it should be taken for granted

[Note: Anderson had withdrawn from the Committee when this question was asked]

*Minimum number and list of subjects for which certificate or diploma should be given*

Some minimum should be agreed upon but the present report not the place (3)

Submitted for discussion:

Classification

Decimal

Expansive

Cataloging

Classed

Dictionary

Library economy

Accession work

Shelf-listing

Loan systems

One instructor for every fifteen students (2)

One fourth of the work for beginners, entering the school on appointment to a position, be practical work (4)

The above impractical (2)

Certificate (2)

Pass card (2)

Either form but state plainly that the credential represents a summer school course (1)

Classification

Decimal

Cataloging

Dictionary

Library economy

Accession work

Shelf-listing

Loan systems

<p>Binding and rebinding Supplies and statistics Order work Reference work, lectures and problems Bibliography, trade Book selection</p>	<p>Binding and rebinding Supplies and statistics Order work Reference work, lectures and problems Bibliography, trade Book selection</p>
<p>FOR APPRENTICE CLASSES AND CORRESPONDENCE COURSES</p>	
Apprentice classes <sup>b</sup>	Correspondence courses
<p><i>Entrance requirements</i> 2 years of college work 15 hours weekly of literature and history (4) Examination (2) General literature, history, current events (1)</p> <p><i>Instruction</i> Apprentice shall receive instruction as well as be allowed to practice in the library of-fering the apprenticeship (3) Instruction be in all departments of the library's work, except the administrative (3) Course be six months in length (3) Time spent in instruction and practice—24 hours weekly (3) One half of each day be devoted to a course in required reading [not discussed] Note: "One member thought the Committee had no jurisdiction to fix standards for apprentice classes, as being an affair of the individual library"</p> <p><i>Test and credentials</i> No certificate or general letter, but a specific letter when the applicant becomes a candidate for a given position (3)</p>	<p>Applicant should have a paid position as librarian or library assistant, or a definite written appointment to a library position (4) Disapproved altogether of correspondence courses (2)</p> <p>No information</p> <p>No information</p>

<sup>b</sup>The standards proposed were intended to apply only to those apprentice classes which "are taught with a view to securing positions in other libraries."

*Minimum number and list of subjects for which certificate or diploma should be given*

Classification

Decimal

Cataloging

Dictionary

Library economy

Accession work

Shelf-listing

Loan systems

Binding and rebinding

Supplies and statistics

Order work

No information

### Action on the report

There was, according to the *Proceedings*, no discussion on what were the first officially formulated standards of training; not until six months later was the Committee informed that its report, along with all other committee reports, had been accepted under a blanket announcement.<sup>6</sup> The vote of Council, at the Conference, to suspend the bylaw relating to the Committee, in order to enlarge it to eight members, nevertheless sustained the hope that the enlarged Committee would continue the pursuit of standards and would attempt to apply them.<sup>7</sup> In view of the manifestations of divisive attitudes which were expressed at the 1905 Portland Conference, the vote of Council was a commendable and, perhaps, a courageous gesture of confidence extended to the Committee on Library Training.

### MORE VIEWS ON TRAINING

#### Portland Conference: views on training

The lack of unanimity which characterized the Committee report characterized also the discussion of both aspects of training—training in library school and training acquired elsewhere—at an open session at the Conference.<sup>8</sup> Proponents of each seemed willing to concede to the view of the other; consequently, though the mood was amicable, little assurance was offered that formal training was after all essential. The mood was fostered by the conciliatory but sentimental introductory speech made by Lutie E. Stearns,<sup>9</sup> of the Wisconsin Free Library Commission, which contained such platitudes as “a good librarian is worthy of his hire; a poor librarian is dear at any price.” While not hesitating to state that trained librarians were preferable to untrained ones, she added that one should, when necessary, take the untrained and insist that he or she “make an intelligent study of library methods in some model small library or through a series of library institutes, or in

summer library schools." In that manner did she equate the training of the two sources.

F. M. Crunden, of the St. Louis Public Library, agreeing that trained service was necessary to the conduct of a library, held nevertheless that the training could be "obtained as well, though not so quickly or pleasantly, by practical work in a library as by a course in a library school." He argued further that library school training had to be supplemented by practical experience before competent librarians could be made.<sup>10</sup>

Miss Plummer, representing library school training, appeared less persuasive than she had during other discussions, as, for example, at the meeting of the Illinois Library Association. She appeared to be emphasizing, if not exaggerating, the fact that library schools had been developed for the *average* library employee. Perhaps conscious of the individuals who were functioning without formal training, Miss Plummer stressed that

The born librarian will not need a school to teach him principles of classification—put him into a library and he will take to them as a duck to water—he will evolve systems of classification and cataloging, and methods of administration without ever going near a school, and the schools will adopt his principles and methods and learn from him.

But there will never be many of him, and there will be thousands of library employees, and it is for these that our schools are at present intended.<sup>11</sup>

Frances Jenkins Olcott, in discussing "Rational Library Work with Children and the Preparation for It," more persuasively advocated the need for formal training than had Miss Plummer, as she reviewed the developments of the program in the Training Class for Children's Librarians.<sup>12</sup>

Though the Committee on Library Training had registered some disapproval of correspondence courses, Theresa Hitchler, Superintendent of Cataloging, Brooklyn Public Library, addressed herself directly to Dewey, asking him to open a correspondence school. Dewey, in a striking bit of circumlocution, succeeded in evading an equally direct response. Summarizing first the sources of training available, he concluded:

This question of library training is not the question of the library school alone—the correspondence teaching, the round table, the institute, these meetings, the graduate school. It is multiform. It reaches out in all directions, and it is the great question that is before us.<sup>13</sup>

Herbert Putnam dramatized the discrepancies in the views being expressed by noting with some detachment:

I have sat here and listened, and wondered as to the effect of a



report of this discussion upon the general public that we are seeking to influence. We have had our statement in behalf of training, we have had our statement in behalf of experience; but offset by that we have had concessions from the people who are occupied with systematic training and from practical librarians who are concerned with the practical experience of the people under them. We have had concessions from those, and then we have had affirmative, positive statements from others to the effect that after all training is not the essential thing.

On the basis of such conflicting and contradictory evidence, Putnam stated that a news reporter might well headline a report of the session, "Trained Librarians Not Necessary After All." In contrast to Putnam, who stated with conviction that he would not hesitate to give pre-eminent importance to systematic training, proponents of library schools had not made equally positive statements throughout the discussion.

The disturbing implications of Putnam's proposed headline could not have been a problem easily dismissed by those concerned with training. Not only had Miss Plummer, as a representative of library school training, implied that training was not actually necessary for all, but she had justified the inclusion in the 1905 Committee report that "library schools are themselves somewhat uncertain as yet as to the necessary foundations of their work." Equally uncertain were the practicing librarians, among whom there were some who did not consider formal training essential at all. Such were the divisive attitudes prevalent at the Conference to which the standards of training were transmitted.

#### Dewey's last view on the future of library schools

Before his resignation as state librarian and his withdrawal from the New York State Library School, Dewey, in 1905,<sup>14</sup> extended the remarks which he had made at the Portland Conference. There he had implied that library training could not be for all and, indeed, that it would be absurd to insist on securing library school graduates for all library work, particularly in small libraries with limited budgets. In further explanation, he wrote on "The Future of Library Schools,"<sup>15</sup> wherein he surveyed the entire field of training, from that provided for the totally unequipped by means of traveling libraries, round tables, and institutes, to the formal training offered in summer and winter library schools. He warned that it was useless to decry those agencies, such as summer schools, institutes, and round tables, because their standards were lower and their courses shorter than those of the established schools, for he felt that they, in addition to library meetings and professional journals, would continue to offer training to the thousands of librarians unable to attend the lengthier programs.

In anticipating the future of the library schools, Dewey foresaw the development of three university graduate schools prepared to offer the highest training, located strategically: one on the Atlantic seaboard in

Boston, Washington, or New York; one in Chicago, which he described as "perhaps the best library center of all"; and one on the West Coast, which appeared imminent. As early as 1901, Dewey had encouraged the development of a school on the West Coast when, in writing to President B. I. Wheeler, of the University of California, he maintained:

I am personally more interested in the development of library interests and of a strong library school at Berkeley than at any other point in the world I think, because there is a pressing need for it in that great section. . . . I believe that you will come to believe it a matter of large importance to make Berkeley the recognized center of library influence for that part of the world.<sup>16</sup>

Dewey predicted, just as Mrs. Fairchild had done in 1902, that library schools would be associated with universities and, as evidence of the depth of his conviction, he expressed a willingness to have the New York State Library School transferred to a satisfactory university.

Despite his concept of three graduate library schools, Dewey's planning for the future lacked the imaginative and vigorous approach so generally evidenced by him in his earlier writings. To a large extent, it represented a crystallization of the ideas which he had advanced in *Library Notes* seventeen years earlier.<sup>17</sup> When read in conjunction with the standards presented by the 1903 and 1906 Committees on Library Training, it is far less significant as a prophetic study; it is more a realistic acceptance of the developments in the field. Even the proposal for a graduate school was not new; its novelty lay in its specific proposal for the establishment of three schools located in strategic areas.

### Criticism and publicity in *Public Libraries*

Mary Eileen Ahern, continuing the policy established by her inclusion in *Public Libraries* in 1903 of a letter from a library school student, published additional comments in 1906 from former students. She included also a comprehensive survey of training programs based on information secured from the training agencies themselves.

### *Criticisms from former students*

Six letters from former students, only one of which was anonymous, were preceded by Miss Ahern's editorial reflections on the present state of affairs, in which a fear of consequences haunted the critic of the library school. She expressed her concern over the reluctance of students to criticize the schools by contending that

the effect of living in an atmosphere of instructors on pedestals is anything but wholesome to one who is going out to lead a movement in a large or small community. While there should be a reverence for fine character and respect for learning, there should not be a subduing of the individual opinion and standing caused by the atmosphere of the school.<sup>18</sup>

The first of the six letters<sup>19</sup> was the anonymous one, in which the writer spoke of her pride in her library school degree but referred also to the criticism that library schools were adding to their faculties too many graduates without practical experience. About such instructors the writer asked, "In the seclusion of the library school what can they know of the complex problems daily faced by the librarian in a small town?" The signed letters were from Lillian B. Arnold, of the University of Illinois; Alice G. Millard, of the Montreal Summer School; Harriet B. Gooch, of the Pratt Institute; Edith M. Burrage, of Simmons College; Leon M. Solis-Cohen, of the New York State Library School.

The willingness of the five students to affix their names to their critical remarks should have allayed somewhat Miss Ahern's concern over their fear of reprisal. The library schools could have profited little from the generalizations in the letters, such as "very little personal encouragement is given by the instructors," or "we were, perhaps, taught to stand too much in awe of our work." There was some profit in knowing, however, that the graduates were finding as much to praise as they were to deplore.

In contrast to the informal communications from the six students, a graduate of the Armour Institute Library Training Class, Irene Warren, proposed a study of library schools involving four questions: (1) what the school teaches; (2) who does the teaching; (3) what equipment it has; (4) what the character of its pupils is.<sup>20</sup> She would not have been content with listing the courses but more in structuring them to secure unity through proper sequence and to reduce friction, duplications, and poorly abridged transitions.

She would have inquired of the faculty their qualifications, their schooling, and their time spent in study and thought, since they should be absorbed in the principles and philosophy underlying their subjects. Concern was expressed over the "surprisingly little" contributed by the faculties of the library schools to the literature of the profession. Other questions were posed relating to the need of a laboratory, the association of library schools with scholarly institutions, the place in the larger curriculum for the library courses, and the similarity of library school curricula.

Miss Warren, just as H. L. Elmendorf had done at the meeting of the New York Library Association in 1903, commented on the fact that few men had enrolled in library schools and that few had found an interest in the teaching of library science. She observed further that, despite their lack of library school training, the librarians of the large libraries were men from other vocational fields, and she wondered if other fields trained better for administrative positions. Questioning whether the schools were training only for the small library or assistantships in somewhat larger ones, Miss Warren asked, "Would a graduate school with advanced work in bibliography and administrative problems fit the students for those more responsible positions?"

Though answers were not offered to the questions raised, Miss Warren provided for those interested in *standardizing* library training

programs an array of disconcerting and provocative ideas. Her questions could not have been answered, however, in so simple a form as those relating to the quantitative minimal standards to be agreed upon later by the Committee on Library Training.

*A directory of library training agencies*

Miss Ahern made a second contribution when, as a result of inquiries concerning the schools, she asked the directors of the various types of training agencies to furnish information on their programs and a statement expressing their aim.<sup>21</sup> In response to her inquiry the following schools furnished data:

*Library schools*

Carnegie Library of Pittsburg. Training School for Children's Librarians  
Drexel Institute, Philadelphia  
Indiana State Normal School  
University of Illinois State Library School  
Kansas State Normal School, Emporia  
The New York State Library School  
Pratt Institute School of Library Training  
Simmons College Library School  
Southern Library School, Carnegie Library of Atlanta  
Wisconsin Library School<sup>22</sup>

*Summer library schools*

Chautauqua Library School  
Iowa Summer Library School  
McGill University, Montreal  
Minnesota<sup>23</sup> [at the University under the direction of the Public Library Commission]

*Training classes*

Brooklyn Public Library  
Cincinnati Public Library  
New York Public Library<sup>24</sup>

Presumably the only criterion for inclusion in the listing in *Public Libraries* was the acceptance of the invitation issued by Miss Ahern, for it was not complete. Though it included two schools not examined by the Committee on Library Training—the Indiana State Normal School<sup>25</sup> and the Kansas State Normal School, Emporia<sup>26</sup>—the Committee included three programs not in *Public Libraries*: Indiana, Syracuse, and Western Reserve. It is possible that the latter three failed to respond to the request from Miss Ahern, who implied that some schools had not furnished information.<sup>27</sup>

The listing of the summer library schools was most inadequate when compared to that of the 1906 report, which, though omitting McGill University, included five more programs than did *Public Libraries*. Those five were the summer schools of New York State, Indiana, New Jersey, Washington, and Wisconsin.<sup>28</sup> Despite its inadequacies, however, the listing provided factual information on training programs

throughout the country, though it offered no evaluative comments as did the Committee on Library Training.

# APPLYING THE STANDARDS, 1906

In accordance with the recommendations of the 1903 and 1905 reports of the Committee on Library Training, the membership for 1906 was deliberately selected so as to represent varied fields<sup>29</sup> of interest as follows:

<i>To represent</i>	<i>Person selected</i>
A member of a state library commission	Henry E. Legler, secretary, Wisconsin Free Library Commission
The librarian of a free circulating library of, at least, 50,000 volumes	John Cotton Dana, librarian, Free Public Library, Newark, N.J.
The librarian of a college or a reference library	Azariah Smith Root, librarian, Oberlin College
A library trustee interested in questions of training	William C. Kimball, trustee, Passaic, N.J.
Four library school graduates engaged in library work in various kinds of libraries and in various capacities, including one from the faculty of a library school	Mary Wright Plummer, director, Pratt Institute Library School Grace Delphine Rose, head, Open Shelf Department, Davenport, Iowa, Public Library Isabel Ely Lord, librarian, Pratt Institute Free Library Eleanor Roper, assistant, John Crerar Library

The enlarged Committee, under the chairmanship of Mary Wright Plummer, made a decision to consider the standards for library schools offering winter and summer programs but "for the present, *to suggest no standards or regulations for apprentice classes and correspondence courses.*"<sup>30</sup> (Italics mine.) This seemed a particularly wise decision because of the inability of the 1905 Committee to formulate standards for the latter training programs.

Having delimited its responsibilities to refining the standards for winter schools and summer schools and to the testing of designated programs according to the standards, the Committee by a majority vote accepted the following standards:

## *For winter schools*<sup>31</sup>

1. Entrance requirements
  - a. Three years beyond the high school preparation
  - or
  - b. An entrance examination in
    - (1) history

- (2) literature
- (3) language
- (4) economics

2. Instruction

- a. At least one-third of the instructors to have been trained in and graduated from a recognized library school
- b. At least one-third of the instructors to be experienced in other libraries than those connected with the school
- c. Some of the instructors to have library duties
- d. One instructor to every ten students in laboratory work
- e. At least one-sixth of the students' time to be given to practical library work under supervision

3. Tests and credentials

The giving of a certificate or diploma at the end of the course, which shall certify to the satisfactory completion of the course, but not to fitness for library work

4. Subjects to be taught

- a. Classification
  - (1) Decimal
  - (2) Expansive
- b. Cataloging
  - (1) Classed
  - (2) Dictionary
- c. Library economy
  - (1) Accession work
  - (2) Shelf-listing
  - (3) Loan systems
  - (4) Binding and rebinding
  - (5) Supplies and statistics
  - (6) Order work
- d. Reference work, lectures and problems
- e. Bibliography, trade
- f. Book selection<sup>32</sup>

Comparison of the 1905 and 1906 standards

The 1906 standards represented the majority opinion as expressed by the eight committee members; had the opinions been identified according to individual vote as the 1905 standards had been, doubtless there would have been a similar pattern of variation. In general, however, the majority opinion in 1906 was similar to the majority opinion of 1905. The 1906 standards for "Tests and credentials" and "Subjects to be taught" were exactly the same; compromises were made, however, in regard to "Entrance requirements" and "Instruction."

Concerning entrance requirements, the 1906 Committee codified the variant opinions ranging from "no opinion" to three years of college including the alternative of entrance by examination and, as the 1905

Committee had done, offered an alternative of three years beyond high school *or* entrance by examination. Neither alternative was so high or so low as the entrance requirements then existing, for the New York State Library School had been requiring a college degree for admission since 1902,<sup>33</sup> and Syracuse University had been admitting students on the basis of a high school diploma or a blank filled out by a high school principal.<sup>34</sup>

Concerning instruction, the 1906 Committee liberalized the 1905 standards somewhat in omitting the requirement that "two-thirds [of the instructional staff] have practical experience in library work or wide academic training" and in simply stating that some of the instructors should have library duties. Omitted completely was the suggestion that "instructors should keep in close touch with practical library work."

Eleven winter schools were examined according to the standards of 1906. They were: New York State, Pratt Institute, Drexel Institute, Illinois University, Carnegie School for Children's Librarians, Simmons College, Western Reserve University, Southern Library School, Wisconsin Library School, Indiana, and Syracuse University. Of the eleven, seven had been included in the report of 1903: New York State, Pratt Institute, Drexel Institute, Illinois University, Carnegie School for Children's Librarians, Simmons College, and Syracuse University.<sup>35</sup> Two schools included in that report were extinct: the schools at Columbian University and the University of Chicago.<sup>36</sup> Four programs not hitherto included were those of Western Reserve, Southern Library School, Wisconsin Library School,<sup>37</sup> and that at Indiana.<sup>38</sup>

### Application of the standards

Of the eleven schools examined, five met all the standards as formulated; they were Pratt Institute, Drexel Institute, Illinois University, the Southern Library School, and Wisconsin.<sup>39</sup> The New York State Library School, in requiring a degree for admission, exceeded the minimum standards as defined, though the Committee report made no reference to that feature of the program. The specific references to failures in meeting the standards were as follows:

New York State Library School failed to meet the requirement of allotting one-sixth of the students' time to practical work.

Carnegie School for Children's Librarians failed to include in its entrance examinations questions on languages and in the standard for "Tests and Credentials" certified to fitness for a definite division of library work rather than to the satisfactory completion of the course.<sup>40</sup>

Simmons College delayed awarding its certificate until the student had worked for three months satisfactorily in some library rather than choosing to let the certificate imply the satisfactory completion of course work only.<sup>41</sup> Simmons failed also to offer instruction in classed cataloging.

Western Reserve failed to offer instruction in classed cataloging.

Indiana failed to include in its entrance examinations questions on languages and failed to allocate one-sixth of the students' time to practical work but did report one-tenth of the time so spent.

Syracuse failed to require either three years of college or an entrance examination but admitted students having a high school preparation; failed to have one-third of its instructors trained in and graduated from a recognized library school, but had only one instructor in five (not a graduate) from a recognized library school, the others being alumni of the school; failed to have one-third of its instructors experienced in other libraries than those connected with the school, but had one instructor with public library experience with the remainder knowing of other libraries only through visits; failed to allocate one-sixth of the students' time to practical work.

### *Conclusions*

Just as in 1903, Syracuse violated most flagrantly the minimum standards which the Committee on Library Training had formulated, but in general the pattern of conformity to the minimum standards as defined was evident. Fortunately the Committee recognized that what it had been doing was patterning the *status quo*, not establishing standards toward which the schools could have been striving; for, having completed the evaluation of 1906, the Committee concluded, "It would seem as if the committee would have to set its recommendations still higher, if it wishes to prove any school appreciably below standard."<sup>42</sup>

### Standards for summer schools

The Committee on Library Training for 1906, relying on the standards formulated by the 1905 Committee, adopted by majority vote the following standards,<sup>43</sup> which were practically the standards of 1905:

1. Entrance requirements
  - a. a paid position as librarian or assistant  
or
  - b. a definite appointment to a paid position
2. Instruction
  - a. one instructor trained in a recognized library school
  - b. two instructors with experience in other libraries than that connected with the school<sup>44</sup>
  - c. one instructor to every fifteen students
  - d. one-fourth of the curriculum allocated to practical work
3. Tests and credentials
  - 5 out of 8 voted for a pass card stating subjects
  - 3 voted for certificates stating plainly that the course completed was a summer school course
4. List of subjects  
(Same as those included in the 1905 standards)



### *Application of the standards*

The following eight summer schools submitted to the testing of their programs by the standards of 1906: New York State, Chautauqua, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana, Iowa, New Jersey, and Washington.<sup>45</sup> Six of the summer schools had been examined in 1903: New York State, Chautauqua, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana, and Iowa. Three programs included in the 1903 report were no longer in existence: Amherst, California, and Missouri; two new programs were added: New Jersey<sup>46</sup> and Washington.

The eight programs met the minimal requirements except in the following instances: (1) entrance requirements: only New Jersey and Washington failed to adopt the recommended entrance requirements; (2) instruction: requirements "a" and "c" were met by all the schools except Washington; three schools either failed to respond to "b" or actually failed to meet the standard: New Jersey, Iowa, and Washington. Only three schools allocated one fourth of their time to practical work. Chautauqua and Wisconsin were identified as being among those which did not allocate that amount of time; (3) tests and credentials: all the schools met the recommendation that their credentials show the course offered was a summer course; (4) subjects: all the schools gave instruction in the list of recommended subjects except for the New York State Library School, which, because of its association with Chautauqua, devoted each year to a specific subject and left the general course to Chautauqua.

The general comment of the Committee was applicable to the summer school standards also, that "it would seem as if the committee would have to set its recommendations still higher, if it wishes to prove any school appreciably below standard."<sup>47</sup>

### Acceptance of the 1906 Report by the Association

Though the Committee of 1903 had proposed that the enlarged committee not only present a report but that that report be discussed and not accepted simply as a matter of routine, Council ignored the recommendation. The decision not to attempt to legislate responses was a wise one, for the 1906 Report was simply *accepted*.<sup>48</sup> The *Proceedings* record no discussion of the first evaluative review of the winter schools and the summer schools, based on standards which the Committee had been formulating since 1903.

## Activities of the Committee on Library Training: publishing a tract and establishing a section

### PUBLISHING A TRACT ON TRAINING FOR LIBRARIANSHIP

When the Committee on Library Training concluded its 1906 report with a promise of presenting a "statistical showing of all organized sources of library training" in pamphlet form,<sup>1</sup> the promise tended to imply that the second recommendation of 1903 was to be scrutinized.<sup>2</sup> Further encouragement or substantiation was given at a meeting of the A.L.A. Publishing Board in October, 1906, at which time the Board made plans to issue a tract on library schools and training.<sup>3</sup> Yet, when the tract appeared in 1907, it bore no semblance to the publication seemingly under consideration by the Committee on Library Training.

In the Committee report of 1907, moreover, no reference was made to the 1903 recommendation. Instead, the origin of the tract was cited as 1906, when, at the request of one of the state library commissioners, the Committee had undertaken its preparation. According to the chairman of the Committee, authority had been obtained both from the Publishing Board and from the Executive Board to publish the tract.<sup>4</sup> The limitations of the tract, consequently, were the responsibility not only of the Committee but also of the two Boards.

#### Tract on "Training for Librarianship"

The brief, unimpressive-looking tract of seven pages,<sup>5</sup> bearing the name of the Committee on Library Training, was an appallingly inadequate summation, at best, of the kinds of training available. No reference was made in it to the efforts of the Committee on Library Training to define standards, nor was the name of any one school included. The paragraph on "Admission to schools" negated the work of the Committee as well as illustrated the Committee's reluctance, with perhaps the concurrence of the Boards, to include the 1906 standards. The paragraph, descriptive and not evaluative, read as follows:

The object of the Library Schools is to provide for persons *already well-prepared as to general education*, the training in technique and administration necessary to fit them for librarianship. The test of general education is different in different schools, some accepting the college degree, some the high-school diploma, some

making their own entrance examination, and others associating the technical with regular college work, and therefore incorporating their entrance tests with those of the college. Some schools are associated with reference, some with college or university, and some with free circulating libraries, the practical work given to the student (a most important part of the training) being usually in the library with which the school is associated.<sup>6</sup>

Though no statement was included which indicated that the tract had been published at the insistence of state library commissions, the Committee named twenty-seven states having commissions and inferred that each could be consulted as to sources of training. The concluding paragraph deliberately transferred the responsibility of selecting a desirable school to the state commissions and made no reference to the reports of the Committee on Library Training which had referred to specific programs.

#### *No listing of schools*

Did the Committee deliberately plan to omit the list of schools? According to Mary Wright Plummer, such a decision was made despite the fact that considerable pressure was brought to bear upon the Committee.<sup>7</sup> The reluctance to list the schools and to indicate "the character and standing of the various schools" was justifiable, not only because of the Committee's inability, for financial and other reasons, to visit the schools for evaluative purposes, but also because the chairmanship of the Committee was held by the director of one of the schools which merited evaluation. Miss Plummer tactfully acknowledged the impropriety of her participation in an investigative program by stating that "such an investigation could not properly be conducted or such a list published with any member of a library school faculty acting as chairman."<sup>8</sup>

#### *Action by the Association*

It would have been proper, seemingly, for the tract to have included the names of those programs mentioned in the 1906 report, since that report had been accepted, even though without comment, by the Association. The omission might perhaps be attributed to the inclusion of a list of schools in the *Handbook* of the Association, issued in September, 1907.<sup>9</sup> In it appeared a section on "Library Schools," in which the following schools with the names of the directors and the dates of establishment were given:

New York Library School  
 Pratt Institute Library School  
 Drexel Institute Library School  
 University of Illinois Library School  
 Simmons College Library Training School  
 Western Reserve University Library School  
 Winona Technical Institute Library School

### Wisconsin Library School

Library Training School of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta

The Carnegie library training school for Children's Librarians, Pittsburgh... offers instruction in its special field.

Summer schools in library science are conducted at The New York State Library School, by the State library commissions in Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, New Jersey, Indiana, at the State Universities of California and Washington and at Simmons College in Boston.<sup>10</sup>

The list duplicated most of that contained in the report of the Committee on Library Training for 1906, except for the omission of the school at Syracuse University and a more specific reference to the school in Indiana. The latter was identified as the "Winona technical institute library school, Indianapolis; Merica Hoagland, director, 1905." Of the summer school programs, no reference was made to the Chautauqua summer school, which was in existence, whereas the programs at the University of California and at Simmons College had not been included in the 1906 report.<sup>11</sup> The *Handbook*, readily available, offered to the state library commissions a fairly accurate listing of existing programs. It supplemented also the survey of "Library Schools" which had appeared earlier in *Public Libraries*.<sup>12</sup>

The Association included a listing of the schools in its handbooks for 1908 and 1909. The list of 1908 was similar to that of 1907 except for the following two changes: (1) the reference to the Winona Technical Institute Library School was deleted and instead the name of the Indiana Library School, with date of founding as 1908, added; (2) the references to summer schools in Wisconsin and the state universities of California and Washington were omitted and the elusive phrase, "and elsewhere," added to the paragraph on summer schools.<sup>13</sup> In the 1909 list no reference was made to summer school programs, but the name of Syracuse University Library School, Mary J. Sibley, director, and date of establishment, 1908, was added to the list of library schools.<sup>14</sup>

By 1910 the Executive Board, concerned lest the mere listing of the schools in the *Handbook* constituted an expression of opinion, voted that the list be omitted from the *Handbook* and that the secretary be instructed, in answering any queries concerning a school, "to disclaim any endorsement of the same by the American Library Association."<sup>15</sup>

### Committee efforts to publish a list of schools

Following the publication of the tract on "Training for Librarianship," the Committee on Library Training continued to discuss the possibility and advisability of publishing a list of library schools. A stimulus for further consideration had been the unwillingness or reluctance of the state library commissions to accept the responsibility transferred to them of recommending training programs. Such a reluctance was strongly expressed by Henry E. Legler, both a member of the Committee and secretary of the Wisconsin Free Library Commission, who was keenly aware of the responsibility.

At its meeting of February 11, 1908, the Committee decided, after considerable expression of divergent opinions, not to assume the responsibility either but to transfer the problem to Council. Consequently, the following motion was approved for transmittal to Council:

Inasmuch as many requests have been received that a list of accredited schools be added to the tract on library training, Resolved that Council be asked to consider whether such a list is desirable, and if it be thought important, that the Council be asked to appropriate \$500, that the Committee may make such investigation as is essential in order that the Committee may feel warranted in making a recommendation.<sup>16</sup>

### *Council rejection*

Council, rejecting the implication of the motion, that it could, by its vote, confirm the desirability of such a list, informed the Committee that it would adhere "to its established precedent of taking no action looking toward any expression of opinion on library schools."<sup>17</sup>

The decision seemed to be an attempt to disavow Association responsibility for any expression of opinion. It was true that Council had never been asked to lend its authority to a plan for evaluating library schools; yet the establishment of the Committee on Library Training to make recommendations implied nothing less than that an expression of opinion, substantiated or unsubstantiated, would be made. Moreover, the recent efforts of that Committee to define standards had been undertaken with the presumed consent of the Association.

The pattern of "established precedent" actually was the reverse of the 1908 statement. The precedent, prior to 1908, included the adoption of a bylaw establishing a Committee on Library Training, the acceptance of the report of 1903, the knowledge that the Committee was continuing its search for standards, the acceptance of the 1905 report which had formulated standards of training, and of the 1906 report which had refined and applied the standards. It was climaxed with the acceptance of the Committee's conclusion that standards would have to be set higher if it wished to prove any school appreciably below standard. Council had offered no objection to the word, "accredited," as used in the 1906 report, which had stated: "It is to be hoped that enough good schools, in *accredited* hands, may spring up to do away with the chances of success for poor ones."<sup>18</sup> (*Italics mine.*)

The Association in accepting Council's decision was girding itself for a more restraining action of the future—the decision of the Executive Board of 1910 to omit the names of the schools from the *Handbook* and to disclaim any endorsement whatever of any school. Meanwhile the Committee on Library Training sponsored a variant alternative—the establishment within the Association of a section to be concerned with all aspects of preparation for librarianship.

## ESTABLISHING A SECTION ON PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

### Justification for the Section

Though the Committee on Library Training, in accordance with the view of Council, refrained from expressing any opinions on the individual programs referred to in its report of 1908,<sup>19</sup> it did, in seeking an explanation for the sporadic and uneven growth of training programs, offer an opinion. It attributed the attempts to (1) the limited number of graduates from the established schools and the higher salaries sought by them; (2) the forcing of many libraries, unable to pay high salaries, to train their own assistants; (3) the failure on the part of those offering private instruction to comprehend the responsibility assumed. Of the last, the Committee concluded that "the private venture in the way of training is, as a rule, the most superficial offer that is made and can more easily be accused of self-interest than any other."

Having ventured to make such an analysis, the Committee evidenced its concern by proposing the establishment of a Normal Section<sup>20</sup> within the Association which would survey all aspects of preparation for librarianship. The recommendation was not an isolated proposal but was, as indicated in the recommendation, prompted by the recurrent questions and the desire of library schools for mutual consultation. The Committee seemed justified in citing the need for "mutual consultation" since, following the appraisal of 1906, there had been two meetings of library school teachers, the first such meetings ever held.

### *Meeting of library school teachers, 1907*

Though presumably one of the library schools assumed the initiative in planning for a meeting of teachers during the Asheville Conference of 1907, just who was responsible is not known. Possibly Miss Plummer was involved since she was elected temporary chairman, the usual recognition bestowed on an initiator. An external stimulus for the meeting can be identified—the editor of *Public Libraries*, who advocated that such a meeting, suggested by several persons, be held.<sup>21</sup> Not only did Mary Eileen Ahern express a hope that a library pedagogy might be developed, but she felt that the opportunity would be beneficial for those not associated with library schools to see and hear those engaged in teaching. She saw in such a meeting an opportunity also of dissolving the feeling that "library economy is a sort of mystery, something more than the average person can comprehend."

A meeting was held during which only one aspect of teaching, that of co-operative lecturers, was discussed, and later a committee, under the chairmanship of W. W. Brett, was appointed to study the problem. The general opinion expressed was that "the time was not yet ripe to ask for a section, but that a round table would probably meet the needs of those most interested." Having reached such a decision, the group authorized Miss Plummer and James I. Wyer, Jr., appointed chairman

and secretary for the ensuing year, to ask for a round table and to ask also for a place on the general program at the conference of 1908.<sup>22</sup>

Though the editor of *Public Libraries* expressed some disappointment over the meeting, stating that it had been approached in "rather a gingerly fashion" and that the restraint which permeated the group imparted a "backwardness about going on record in favor of a union of interests,"<sup>23</sup> there was less backwardness than Miss Ahern implied, for a second meeting was held within a few months.

### *Meeting of library school teachers, 1908*

When the Committee on Library Training met on February 11, 1908, to discuss publishing information on library schools and other sources of training, representatives from five library schools met, presumably at the invitation of Miss Plummer. Two of the five, Miss Plummer and H. E. Legler, were members of the Committee—the other three were Miss Kroeger, director of Drexel Institute; Miss Wiggin, of Simmons College Library School; and Mrs. Sibley, director of Syracuse University Library School.<sup>24</sup> The official topic for discussion continued to be co-operative lecturers, the topic assigned to Brett, who had concluded that "a circuit for library school lecturers seems hardly practicable." Since his view was not contradicted, presumably there was a unanimity of agreement in that area.

A common interest in textbooks, evidencing further need of mutual consultation, prompted the approval of a motion to the Publishing Board to consider the publication of a manual of library economy.<sup>25</sup> The initial joint effort of the schools was rewarding ultimately, for the Publishing Board responded by approving the publication of an *A.L.A. Manual of Library Economy*. It appeared, not instantaneously, but in thirty-two issues, chapter by chapter, between the years 1911 and 1929.<sup>26</sup> Later, Williamson was to express a similar concern over inadequate textbooks, among which he included the incomplete *A.L.A. Manual*, because of their brevity and sketchiness.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, the library schools, just as Williamson was to do, expressed as one of their prime needs, the availability of textbooks.

A second common interest was revealed in the appointment of a committee "to consider the question of uniform terminology."<sup>28</sup> It was also an acknowledgment by the library school representatives that little had been done since 1903, at which time the Committee on Library Training had urged that a general revision of nomenclature be undertaken by the schools. A third matter on which the group agreed was that the American Library Association include on the general program a "symposium on the evolution of the library school curriculum." The participants in that symposium were to be appointed by the directors of New York State Library School, Pratt Institute, Drexel Institute, and the Carnegie school at Pittsburgh.

Though it was agreed that other matters would be discussed at the Minnetonka meeting, there is no record of a meeting of library school representatives at the Conference of 1908. Direct results were achieved,

however, because the Association accepted the suggestion that a symposium be held as requested. With the knowledge of the accomplishments of the two meetings of library school teachers, Miss Plummer, as chairman of the Committee on Library Training, phrased the recommendation for the creation of a Normal Section.

#### *At the Minnetonka Conference, 1908*

Following the presentation of the report of the Committee on Library Training, the symposium was held;<sup>29</sup> it was identified, however, as being part of the Committee's contribution rather than a program sponsored by the library schools. It was, nevertheless, the first program proposal which emanated from the library schools' representatives for which they were directly responsible. Miss Plummer spoke first on the "Evolution of the Library School Curriculum," in which she urged that for the best curriculum; "We need some intelligent imitation, or more consultation with other schools." Other informative contributions were made by James I. Wyer, Jr., on five "Factors in the Development of the Library School Curriculum"; by Miss Plummer on "Evolution of the Pratt Institute Library School Curriculum"; by Miss Kroeger on "Evolution of the Curriculum of the Drexel Institute Library School"; by Miss Olcott on "The Training of a Children's Librarian." That four directors appointed themselves as participants tends to substantiate an observation made by Williamson fifteen years later when he concluded that

The tendency has existed from the beginning for library schools to be more or less dominated by a single personality. The ideas and ideals of that personality, consciously or unconsciously, mold the content of the courses and even determine the methods of instruction.<sup>30</sup>

#### Successful establishment of the Section

Though the library school faculties apparently did not have a meeting of their own at the 1908 Conference other than for their participation in the symposium, and apparently made no plans for the 1909 Conference, their experiences of 1907 and 1908 demonstrated the value of meetings in which library school matters were discussed. It is not surprising that all but one of the directors approved the efforts of the Committee to establish a section.<sup>31</sup> The exception was Miss Kroeger, who opposed it on the basis that "our committee of Directors can handle most questions that would come up."<sup>32</sup>

No action was taken on the recommendation until June 26, 1909, at which time, despite heavy opposition and attempts to table the motion, Council approved the establishment of the Section on Professional Training for Librarianship.<sup>33</sup> About the new Section, the chairman of the Committee had advised Council:

Personally I cannot help feeling that this formation of a section



is the next step in the natural evolution of training for librarianship, and that until it is taken, no concerted work for its betterment can be hoped for.<sup>34</sup>

It was the view of the Committee, rather than of the opposition, which prevailed.

### Within the Section

The Section, which had been authorized by a reluctant Council, was by its objectives, as defined in the bylaws of 1910, limited to "the discussion of questions pertaining to preparation and qualification for librarianship." It appeared that the Section would be concerned primarily with the problems of library schools since it limited its active membership to:

1. All persons belonging to faculties of library schools, or lecturers for regular courses of three or more lectures, in such schools;
2. Instructors giving three or more lectures in regular training classes.<sup>35</sup>

In the following year, however, the bylaw was enlarged to include as active members faculties and lecturers in summer schools; library school graduates in charge of training classes; and librarians of normal schools conducting classes in library economy.<sup>36</sup> By the enlargement, discussion of all phases of training was assured; at the same time the possibility of a sustained interest only in library schools was lessened. The Section served a useful function, nevertheless, in providing a forum from which were to issue current critical appraisals and future ideas on various kinds of training. From the records of the meetings, some speeches may be extracted which illustrate how certain members of the Association regarded the schools and what their plans for improvement were.

### *Emphasis on library schools, 1909 meeting*

Two concepts of training were offered, during the first Sectional meeting, by Julia E. Elliott of the Pratt Institute Library School and by Adam Strohm, a member of the Committee on Library Training. Though neither was characterized by originality, both agreed that the first-year training could be a terminal course for many librarians identified by Strohm as the "rank and file." Miss Elliott<sup>37</sup> defined more specifically the scope of the first year as being

confined to foundation principles of technical methods, to cultural subjects of practical value, and to intensely practical work both following class work and in the field. The latter to be governed by the location of the school, and to offer specialized opportunity for limited specialization.<sup>38</sup>

Such a program seemed a possible solution to the conditions

confronting library schools: (1) increase in number of libraries without a commensurate increase in the number of library school graduates; (2) failure of the profession to attract people of unusual fitness and ability because of economic problems of compensation; (3) the problems emerging because of the many classes of libraries and because of the many types and kinds of positions within the various classes; (4) the effect of the location and conditions of each school on its practical work.

Strohm seemed motivated, in proposing his plan, not so much by the conditions enumerated by Miss Elliott as by his evaluation of the curricula with "their mixture of trifles and ponderousness," which ranged from "picture bulletins and story hours on one hand; architecture and Latin paleography on the other."<sup>39</sup>

Miss Elliott's second-year program. For a second-year program, Miss Elliott recommended that it be flexible, provide for electives, offer practice work in specialized areas through co-operative plans with many libraries, and be planned for graduates of the one-year programs except in unusual circumstances. The timeliness of the emphasis on specialization was magnified by the organization of the Special Libraries Association at the 1909 Conference, under the leadership of John Cotton Dana.<sup>40</sup> The types of libraries identified as interested in the new organization were "commercial, industrial, technical, civic, municipal, legislative reference and welfare libraries and special departments of public and university libraries."<sup>41</sup> The library schools could not have been unaware that if by 1909 there were enough libraries to warrant a special organization, there would be increasing demands on library schools for the inclusion of specialized training. Such a trend Miss Elliott anticipated in her proposal that opportunities for it be offered both in the first- and the second-year programs.

In recognizing that the location and conditions of each school affected its offering of specialized training, Miss Elliott anticipated the recommendation to be made later by Williamson that the library schools specialize among themselves, particularly in their second-year programs.<sup>42</sup>

Strohm's proposal for a graduate school. In contrast to Miss Elliott's approach, Strohm proposed such courses as "history of libraries, original bibliography, library architecture, library administration, paleography, etc.," for those fit for postgraduate work. He deliberately related his concept of graduate training to that advocated by Aksel G. S. Josephson,<sup>43</sup> reiterating that: (1) such a school should be identified with a university of standing; (2) its faculty should not only be proficient in library techniques but also endowed with scholarship, professional achievements, and a familiarity with pedagogical methods; (3) the students should experience the intimate connection between libraries and the progress of scholarship through their instruction and their studies; (4) the course, entirely separated from existing library schools, would appeal to the select and be attractive not only to college graduates but to those long identified with the profession.

Both Salome Cutler Fairchild and Josephson supported Strohm's

views, the latter taking the opportunity to outline the plan of training which he had long advocated. The Section did not consider the speech worthy of inclusion in its official proceedings and chose instead Edith Tobitt's with its traditional approach to the problem. Yet, after the establishment of the Board of Education for Librarianship in 1924, of which Adam Strohm was made chairman, the minimum standards which were devised for the "Graduate Library School" and the "Advanced Graduate Library School" reflected, not Miss Tobitt's concepts, but those of Josephson and Strohm.<sup>44</sup>

*Library schools and apprentice training,  
meeting of 1910*

In contrast to the 1909 meeting, only one speech, in 1910, was concerned with library schools, whereas four were presented on apprentice class training.<sup>45</sup> The former, presented by Edith Tobitt, of the Omaha Public Library and a graduate of the class of 1897 of the Pratt Institute Library School, was an analysis of characteristics of a good library school.

"The Essentials of a Good Library School." Miss Tobitt succeeded only in summarizing ideas expressed throughout the literature and in offering as her special contribution the proposal that more attention be given to administrative problems. Her main essentials, somewhat abridged, were: (1) a complete physical equipment ready for the use of all classes of library students; (2) entrance requirements of scholastic and general fitness, with the suggestion that one test be successful experience in a library of good standing; (3) a ten months' school year; (4) selection of instructors on the basis of their wide education, library school training, and experience along the lines which they were to teach; (5) teaching by application; (6) an emphasis on library problems in reality, not in theory; (7) development of the bookish tastes of students.<sup>46</sup> In conclusion, Miss Tobitt made the charge, without identifying the schools to which she referred, that

there are some schools in existence which are purporting to teach in full all details of our profession, when in reality only the most elementary instruction is being given, frequently by means of trifling collections of books and other material, and to students wholly unprepared. . . . Schools of this class, and also schools teaching only technical work, should be avoided by the student who works with the end in view of giving the best of himself in the service of the public.<sup>47</sup>

The speech, void of any new or unusual contributions, stimulated some discussion, which, according to the bylaws, justified the existence of the Section. Comments were made by three persons: Hiller C. Wellman, Charles H. Gould, and Frank K. Walter. Wellman, librarian of the Springfield City Library, Springfield, Massachusetts, and not a library school graduate, observed:

If specialists were to be the products turned out from a library school, one course would be necessary, but if general workers, another sort was necessary, and that, therefore, two courses should be offered by the same school.<sup>48</sup>

Criticizing the general courses for offering "too much technical training, and too little culture," Wellman concluded that the students needed much less of the former and instead really needed to learn "the broader considerations of the aims of a library, methods of advertising a library's work, and other administrative problems."

Charles H. Gould, librarian, McGill University, and immediate past president of the American Library Association, disagreed with Wellman, insisting that "library schools exist for instructing in the technique which is peculiar to library work, and which distinguish it from other lines of work." Frank K. Walter, the only library school representative to speak, reminded the Section that the time element was frequently ignored by critics of the schools and that everything could not be given in ten months, but on the basis of the *Proceedings*, he offered no satisfactory evidence of the library schools' fulfillment of any of Miss Tobitt's essentials.

In response to the concept of apprentice training, John Grant Moulton, a graduate of the New York State Library School and, in 1910, librarian of the Haverhill, Massachusetts, Public Library, offered some critical comments, one being an objection to an apprentice class without pay. He emphasized instead that training in the general fields be the responsibility of the accredited schools.<sup>49</sup> Moulton's practical reason for the suggestion was the impropriety of diverting public funds appropriated for library service to the maintenance of schools. Though his reference was unheeded at the time, it is of historic significance, since Williamson was later to employ the same argument in his advocacy of the university environment as the appropriate one for professional training.

In a paragraph excised from the published report, Williamson, in proposing that the Carnegie Corporation aid professional library schools, stated that "municipal libraries should not be expected to devote their resources to training professional librarians."<sup>50</sup>

Hadley on "What Library Schools Can Do for the Profession." Conscious of the expectations of the profession, Chalmers Hadley appraised the library schools in 1912<sup>51</sup> and seconded Miss Elliott's concern over the increasing need for specialized training. Hadley seemed uniquely qualified to advise the library schools because of his varied experience as a library school student, a one-time instructor, a former secretary of the American Library Association, and, as librarian of the Denver Public Library, an employing librarian. Yet his expectations differed little from those recited earlier by Miss Tobitt.

Hadley's five expectations were these: (1) to prevent library ideals from being smothered in the stress of technical work; (2) to develop three related qualities—a sense of proportion, initiative, and judgment;

(3) to supply more men; (4) to provide students with a working knowledge of the relations of the library to the community; (5) to acquaint students with the importance of the library's public relations in general. He cautioned, however, in conclusion, that the profession should not expect the schools to produce finished products, but rather that the profession should rely on the schools to inculcate an attitude "towards public affairs which seeks activity through the medium of books."

Hadley, as H. L. Elmendorf had done earlier,<sup>52</sup> spoke of the need of recruiting men to the field and the consequent need of curriculum revision in order to interest them. He criticized the feminization of the programs by asking:

Do not library school courses, as now arranged, appeal largely to the house-wifely instincts and cannot courses be devised for men who never intend to fill library positions where the exercise of these instincts will ever play so important a part in their work as will problems of administration and questions of policy?

He deplored the tendency within the schools to "give every student a little of everything he may need, as the process of forgetting what he will not use is easier than the work of acquiring it." He urged, instead, that the schools "divide the instructional fields between them and concentrate their individual efforts on special lines." Like Miss Elliott,<sup>53</sup> Hadley was anticipating the plan of specialization to be advanced by Williamson.

There was no real dissent as to the need of specialization or specialized curricula, but the views offered indicated that the library schools were somewhat convinced, as was Williamson later, that specialization was not desirable in the first-year program. Among those responding were William Brett, Josephine Rathbone, and Frank K. Walter.

Brett disagreed with Hadley both on the need of technical training and on specialization, stating that "a definite, solid basis of technical training is an absolutely essential foundation for good library work." He concluded firmly:

I believe that specialization in a one year course is not desirable, even if it were practicable, which it is not for at least two reasons: The time is too short and the expense too great.

He was not, however, indifferent to the need of specialization and offered two alternatives: (1) to seek uniformity of curricula in the first year and to specialize in the second and third years; (2) to urge that colleges give credit for work in library schools.<sup>54</sup>

Miss Rathbone, like Brett, defended a general rather than a specialized curriculum in one year and praised instead the flexibility of all-round instruction as "one of the most valuable assets that the trained librarian can take with him into general library work."<sup>55</sup>

Frank K. Walter, the only vocal representative of a two-year program, reasoned first that "library school courses are what they are

because the libraries want them so," and he identified two requests made on the schools as demands: (1) for universal specialists—masters of every branch of library technique and possessors of extensive knowledge on all subjects; (2) for real specialists in charge of special departments.<sup>56</sup> He admitted later at the Midwinter meeting that the major hindrance in the development of specialized programs was financial and, in conclusion, transferred the responsibility to librarians by warning:

Until libraries are willing to wait long enough for special technical library training to be obtained or until the demand for definite special lines of library training seems fairly steady, most of us, I think, do not feel that we may properly induce students to train for special positions unless such positions are likely to be forthcoming.<sup>57</sup>

Once again, Aksel G. S. Josephson urged the need of bibliographic training, suggesting the need of two schools, one for assistants and one for librarians.<sup>58</sup> C. A. George, librarian, Elizabeth City, New Jersey, proposed the adoption of a certificate plan which would represent accomplishment in one field at a time instead of the giving of diplomas "doubtful at best as representing anything, because of the various courses and requirements of the different schools."

The discussion of 1912, like that at the Portland Conference of 1905, ended in irresolution rather than action. It was an irresolution which stimulated more comment at the ensuing Midwinter meeting, at which time two points suggested by Hadley were discussed. Those points pertained to the elimination of nonessentials in the curricula and to a division of the instructional field to provide for special instruction in special schools.<sup>59</sup> Just as in 1905, at Portland, Herbert Putnam had made penetrating observations on the divisive attitudes on the need of training, in 1913 he synthesized the views and his own reactions. He concluded, in regard to the nonessentials in the curricula, that the criticisms concerning omissions from the present curricula seemed unconvincing; in regard to specialization, that the entire system of education was suffering from its curse. He applauded the library schools for their expressions on the subject and added, as his own opinion, that the specialization required in a research library could not be provided in an ordinary library.<sup>60</sup>

Though inconclusive, the prolonged discussion implied a continuing interest and was an assurance that the library schools were not unaware of the trend toward specialization. It was evident, however, that, without the power of implementation, the Section could continue only to make gratuitous proposals or individual evaluative comments. It was inevitable, ultimately, that for the library schools more than a Section was needed and that they, disappointed over the lack of opportunity for consideration of mutual problems, such as specialization, would resume their own separate meetings.

## The library schools: from 1911 to 1919

### WITHIN THE SCHOOLS

#### Administrative changes within the schools and new programs

##### *Changes by 1911*

The forceful disclaimer of the Executive Board of 1910 of any intent to endorse library schools could have implied that catastrophic changes had occurred since the 1906 report of the Committee on Library Training. Changes had occurred but they were merely routine rather than extraordinary. By 1911 the four oldest schools had experienced administrative changes: three of the directors had departed from the field and the fourth, Mary Wright Plummer, had accepted an appointment as principal of a newly established school. One of the summer programs, meanwhile, that in Wisconsin, had developed into a one-year program.

In the four oldest schools the changes in directorships had been these: (1) Melvil Dewey had resigned from the New York State Library School in 1906 and had been succeeded first by Edwin Hatfield Anderson and later by James Ingersoll Wyer, Jr.;<sup>1</sup> (2) Katharine L. Sharp had resigned from the University of Illinois School<sup>2</sup> and had been succeeded first by Albert S. Wilson and later by Phineas L. Windsor; (3) Alice Bertha Kroeger, having remained with Drexel Institute until her death in 1909, was succeeded temporarily by Salome Cutler Fairchild and later by June Richardson Donnelly;<sup>3</sup> (4) Mary Wright Plummer, of the Pratt Institute Library School, had been succeeded by Josephine Adams Rathbone, who had been the senior teacher in the school under Miss Plummer.<sup>4</sup>

Of these appointments, only about that of Wilson at the University of Illinois could there have been any question. Otherwise there was a pattern of conformity in that the second generation of directors were all graduates of the pioneer Library School. They proffered no revolutionary concepts of training and appeared willing to accept the traditions with few changes other than those made by Windsor at Illinois.

At Illinois. After Miss Sharp's resignation, the position of director of the School was separated from that of librarian of the University; for the former position, the University appointed Wilson,<sup>5</sup> a man without formal library school training. Such an appointment was a blow to the

prestige of library school training, particularly in view of Miss Sharp's qualifications and those of other newly appointed directors. A recognition of the error was seemingly acknowledged in 1909, when an announcement appeared that Phineas Lawrence Windsor had been appointed both librarian and director of the Library School.<sup>6</sup>

Windsor was well qualified for the position, for, in addition to having a degree from Northwestern University, he was a graduate of the New York State Library School of the class of 1897-99. He had had experience in the New York State Law Library, the Library of Congress, and had been, for almost six years, librarian of the University of Texas, where he had also directed the school begun in 1901 by Benjamin Wyche.

The first important change made by Windsor was the equating of the entrance requirements with those of the New York State Library School. In October, 1910, it was announced that beginning in September, 1911, the admission requirement would be a bachelor's degree either in arts or in science.<sup>7</sup> A second decision, made soon after his arrival, was the planning of a summer course of six weeks in co-operation with the Illinois Library Extension Commission.<sup>8</sup> By prompt action Windsor redirected the course of the School, elevating it to a level comparable to that of the New York State Library School in the East.

At Wisconsin. Only one of the summer school programs had achieved a new status since its origin: the Wisconsin Summer School had been lengthened to a one-year course in 1906. At that time the name had been changed to the Wisconsin Library School. By 1909 an agreement had been made with the University of Wisconsin whereby students could receive the degree of bachelor of arts by taking, in the first two years, the regular work of the College and in the junior and senior years completing the work of the Library School.<sup>9</sup> Mary Emogene Hazeltine, who continued as preceptor throughout the period of change, acknowledged her indebtedness to the older schools and allied her program with theirs by references to the "indirect and intangible assistance afforded by their very existence and successful organization."

At the New York Public Library. A new training program was begun in 1911 at the New York Public Library. It was the fourth and last program to which Andrew Carnegie was to contribute funds before the survey of library training, undertaken by Williamson, was sanctioned by the Carnegie Corporation. Not only did Carnegie contribute funds for the building of the New York Public Library, but he was persuaded to make five yearly appropriations of \$15,000 for the establishment of a library school within the Public Library. It was to be for a twofold purpose: "To provide the New York Public Library with trained assistants and to fit for library positions elsewhere suitable candidates who do not wish to remain in New York."<sup>10</sup>

The first announcement pertaining to the School simply stated that "the Directors of the New York Public Library have announced the proposed establishment of a library school." One of those directors was Edwin Hatfield Anderson, who, because of his experience with the training programs at the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh and later as



director of the New York State Library School, was able both to offer practical suggestions and to teach the course in administration.<sup>11</sup>

The School secured as principal Mary Wright Plummer,<sup>12</sup> whose lengthy experience had equipped her to organize the School on a two-year plan. In the first year the course was similar to that in most of the one-year schools; in the second it differed in being a year of paid practice, during which lectures and discussions were interspersed. In accepting the appointment Miss Plummer was fulfilling her own hope that new schools would be established "carrying on the traditions of the present ones by a kind of apostolic succession."<sup>13</sup> She was the only one of the four pioneer directors to assume such a responsibility.

### *Later changes*

By 1917 two programs were elevated to the status of library schools: (1) the training program of the St. Louis Public Library; (2) the program at the University of Washington.

At St. Louis. The training program of the St. Louis Public Library, organized in 1911 under the direction of Mrs. Harriet P. Sawyer, a graduate of the Pratt Institute Library School,<sup>14</sup> became in 1917 the St. Louis Library School. In justifying its transfer, the School announced that it had long been furnishing training of a library school grade and that it would need only to strengthen its teaching and administrative forces and to amplify its instruction to include the teaching of comparative methods in order to merit its new status. The director was Arthur E. Bostwick, librarian, and Mrs. Sawyer, principal.

At Washington. The faculty at the University of Washington approved the extension of its library training program from a four- to a five-year period. The first three years were to be devoted to the study of the liberal arts and sciences; the fourth and fifth years, to the study of library economy. Two degrees were to be offered, either an A.B. or a B.S. degree for the completion of the four-year program; for the fifth-year program, the degree of Bachelor of Library Economy.<sup>15</sup>

All seven of the schools noted were to be among those later examined by Williamson.

### Meetings of library school instructors, 1911-15

Within two years after the establishment of the Section on Professional Training, in whose activities the library school faculties had participated, plans were made for a separate meeting of instructors. The initiative was taken by three representatives, Mary Emogene Hazeltine, of the Wisconsin Library School; Julia M. Whittlesey, of Western Reserve University Library School; and Phineas L. Windsor, of the University of Illinois, who at the time was chairman of the Section.<sup>16</sup> A proposal for a meeting was addressed to the following schools, selected on the basis of their having been listed in Bostwick's *The American Public Library*:

New York State Library School, Albany, N.Y.  
Pratt Institute School of Library Science, Brooklyn, N.Y.  
Drexel Institute Library School, Philadelphia  
University of Illinois Library School, Champaign, Ill.  
Simmons College Library Training School, Boston  
Western Reserve University Library School, Cleveland  
Library Training School of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta  
Wisconsin Library School, Madison  
Indiana Library School, Indianapolis  
Syracuse University Library School, Syracuse  
The Carnegie Library Training School for Children's Librarians,  
Pittsburg<sup>17</sup>

*The invitation of December 9, 1910*

The invitation, dated December 9, 1910, justified the call for an informal meeting because of problems which could be discussed more profitably among the schools rather than within the Section.<sup>18</sup> Accompanying the invitation was a "Tentative List of Subjects for Discussion,"<sup>19</sup> which demonstrated the need. The subjects proposed were these:

1. Is it desirable, and if desirable, is it practicable to make the work of the first year of the two-year schools and the work of the one-year schools more nearly alike? Many junior students in a two-year school enter library work without taking the senior year's work; if the courses in one-year schools are better preparation for library work than the first year's work of the two-year schools, then these juniors are at a disadvantage as compared with students from a one-year school. Some students in the one-year schools may wish to go to a two-year school and take a second year of training; as the courses are at present arranged, this second year's work is almost impossible, because it does not fit onto the work that the student has had.
2. Do we use the most approved pedagogical methods in our class-room work? Do we lecture too much, and give too few quizzes, conferences and reviews? Do we depend too much on the student's taking full notes, when the proper use of printed outlines, or carefully selected required readings, supplemented by a few notes would yield better results? Shall the course in cataloging be put at the beginning of the course, or later? How much do we use the stereopticon?
3. Would it be practicable for several schools to secure a lecturer on some special subject in Library Economy who should give the regular work in that subject in each of these schools? An example of a beginning in this direction is Miss Edna Lyman's work in several schools.<sup>20</sup>
4. Would it be possible for the several schools to combine in securing a lecturer each year to give a short series of lectures on

some one subject, these lectures to be seriously worked up, and to be published after being delivered? The final publication of the lectures, and the combined remuneration from several schools, might be a sufficient incentive to capable persons to do their best work.

5. Are the subjects now in our curricula properly balanced? Is too much time given to learning cataloging and other routine, and consequently too little to a consideration of methods of extending the use of the library by the public?

6. Is it as easy to secure transfer of credit from one school to another as it should be?

Response to the invitation. The invitation was received favorably, for, of the schools invited, only Syracuse and the Carnegie Library Training School for Children's Librarians were not represented. As was to be expected, Windsor was made chairman. From the report of the meeting, it would appear that a need for it had existed, for the consensus was that the topics on the tentative list had been discussed so profitably that "by unanimous consent it was decided to arrange for a similar meeting next year."<sup>21</sup>

#### *Other meetings held*

Four similar meetings were held from 1912 to 1915. During the period of informal meetings, the Section on Professional Training, evidencing perhaps both concern and curiosity, invited Windsor to report in 1913 on the meetings which had been held as of that date. For that he prepared a summary account stating that the meetings had fully justified themselves and would likely continue. At the same time he assured the Section that many of the topics, such as: (1) the cost of library schools and a rough analysis of their expenditures; (2) specialization among the schools; (3) methods of revising students' work, were of little general interest and that in some instances free discussion might have been curtailed in a larger group.<sup>22</sup>

That the meetings continued to justify themselves and offer an opportunity for informal and frank discussion of common problems as well as an exchange of opinions and ideas can be substantiated from a review of the subjects discussed between 1911 and 1915. At the meeting of January 1, 1915, the group organized formally as the Association of American Library Schools.<sup>23</sup>

#### *Subjects discussed at the meetings*

In the first of the meetings of 1911 and 1912, planned chiefly by Phineas Windsor, who served as chairman, discussion centered around the questions originally distributed; in the second meeting, the teaching problems of cataloging, administration of library schools, and the cost of operating schools provided the basis for informative exchanges of experience.<sup>24</sup> During the third meeting, of which Mary Wright Plummer was chairman, four topics were discussed: (1) co-operation in obtaining

lecturers; (2) methods of revising students' work; (3) book selection; (4) specialization among the library schools.<sup>25</sup>

Discussion of topics alone was not an assurance of approval or adoption of idea; nevertheless, the experience tended to offer the group an opportunity to modify or synthesize their school programs could they find a level of desirable uniformity. Presumably agreement was not frequently reached, for in 1915, after three reports had been made on book selection courses, the committee was unwilling "to express an opinion as to the time which should be devoted to the subject of Book Selection."<sup>26</sup> However, just as the Section on Professional Training was providing a forum for discussion for the American Library Association, so were the meetings providing a forum for the library school faculties; and, just as it has been shown that the Section was discussing subjects later emphasized by Williamson, so were the library schools discussing, but not necessarily agreeing upon, similar topics. Two topics discussed both by the schools and later by Williamson will be referred to: (1) practice work and (2) specialization.

**Practice work.** At the January meeting of 1915 a comprehensive survey of practice work was made, and, though there seemed to be some agreement that "practical service in a library is the best test of an applicant's fitness," no uniform pattern emerged as to the value or to the time allotted to it in the curriculum. The absence of a trend toward uniformity was demonstrated by the data, which revealed that among the schools the time allotted to practice work ranged from 120 to 464 hours in the one-year schools and, in the two-year schools, from 400 to 2,559 hours.<sup>27</sup>

A similar absence of uniformity was found in the responses to the questions for discussion:

1-2. Shall preliminary practice work be required of all candidates or only of those without previous experience? Should this work be done before entering the school or should it be supervised practice in the library connected with the school before class work begins?

3. Can preliminary practice work take the place of regular school instruction to any extent?

4. How far can regular practice work take the place of regular school instruction in such courses as Loan, Mending, Reference?

5. Is consecutive work as offered by field practice more beneficial than spread throughout the year? Are not the conditions more normal in field practice?

6. Is it advantageous to have the library depending upon the work of the students? <sup>28</sup>

Williamson was to record evidence of lack of uniformity on practice work in his chapter on "Field Work," but in contrast to the attitudes expressed in 1915 by the library schools, he questioned the value of practice work, his opinion being that

a prolonged period of field practice should not be necessary as a test of the student's general capacity. The faculty should be able, by means of class-room exercises and the so-called class practice, to gain adequate insight into the student's ability. If it cannot be acquired in this way, certainly the chances are small that it will be acquired by means of the so-called practical work.<sup>29</sup>

Specialization. In 1913, ten years before the publication of Williamson's report on *Training for Library Service*, Frank K. Walter had discussed the subject of specialization and, though no action was taken on Walter's proposal, the discussion offers evidence that Williamson was not offering a revolutionary plan of education through his plan of specialization. Rather he was re-emphasizing a concept advocated earlier among a library school group.

Walter suggested two methods of offering specialization: (1) through dividing the courses in different schools; (2) through dividing the field among the different schools. Of the two plans, Walter felt that the second was more possible and that such a plan was in effect, in part, in that children's work was being offered at the Training School in Pittsburgh; work in small libraries, at the Wisconsin School; normal work, at Pratt; and law and legislative work at the New York State Library School. He added, however, that

no school should be encouraged to specialize until it has demonstrated its ability to give general work satisfactorily and that the division of the field should be done by the schools themselves.<sup>30</sup>

Though Williamson was to discuss with more thoroughness the subject of "Advanced or Specialized Work," and to urge that the second year of training be a specialized year, he, like Walter, envisioned a specialization among the schools, for he wrote:

When all professional schools are put on a graduate basis and the work of the first year is organized as a thoroughly well-rounded and complete general course, graduates from all the schools should naturally expect to take a second year of special training wherever accredited courses are offered in the special fields they desire to enter. Graduates from all the schools might go to Western Reserve for children's work, to the New York Public Library for a special business library course, to Wisconsin for legislative reference, to the University of California for a county library course, and so on.<sup>31</sup>

## THE OFFICIAL EXAMINATION OF LIBRARY SCHOOLS BY THE COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY TRAINING

### Interest manifested by the library schools

The library schools quickly acknowledged the authority of the Committee on Library Training by petitioning it to recommend "a minimum standard admission, length of course, and curriculum for library schools."<sup>32</sup> The petition was drafted, according to Windsor, because

of some concern about the attendance at the meetings of library school instructors of representatives unidentified or of schools not up to standard, and because of the desire either to improve them or eliminate them.<sup>33</sup>

The Committee countered by calling attention to the reports of 1905 and 1906 and requested, in turn, that the schools indicate wherein those should be modified or supplemented. The schools cited particularly the need for curriculum revision with proposals that: (1) a revision of the list of studies should be made; (2) an outline of the scope of each subject, the type of work, and number of class periods devoted to it should be given; (3) bibliography should be differentiated from book selection; (4) the proportion of elective periods and study to practice work should be stated as well as to field work and practice work.<sup>34</sup>

The Committee report of 1912 acknowledged the receipt of the suggestions and the assurance that the replies would receive careful consideration. It advised that "a thoroughly satisfactory recommendation, however, will naturally follow, rather than precede, the contemplated inspection of schools."<sup>35</sup>

#### The Committee and the examination

As of 1912 the examination could well be identified as a *contemplated* study rather than a tentative one, for on January 3 the Executive Board had appropriated the sum of \$200 for the work of the Committee.<sup>36</sup> After four years of entreaty and rebuff, the Committee had finally secured less than one half of the sum originally requested in 1908. During those years the Chairman of the Committee, Azariah Smith Root, had considered approaching the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for funds to undertake a study similar to that made by Dr. Abraham Flexner for the medical world.<sup>37</sup> He was dissuaded from pursuing the idea by Miss Plummer, also a member of the Committee; she had admitted with some apprehension:

I am a little afraid of the alternative proposal you speak of, as I doubt if the schools are ready for an examination by outsiders. Their peculiarities and limitations would hardly be understood, and such a committee of investigation might hinder the work and discourage the workers.<sup>38</sup>

The Committee was influenced further by Miss Plummer's objection to giving the investigating committee complete authority. Consequently it was agreed that: (1) the inspection would not be forced upon any school, but that the schools would ask to be visited; (2) each school should be informed of criticism pertaining to it and prepare, to accompany the final report, an explanation or a defense.<sup>39</sup> There is no evidence, however, that other library schools were informed beforehand of the communications among the Committee members or that they necessarily would have approved them.

### *Plans for the examination*

The Committee turned its attention to two problems which the appropriation and a similar one in 1913<sup>40</sup> had created: (1) the devising of a scheme for evaluating the schools; (2) the securing of a competent person to conduct the examination.

The devising of a scheme for evaluating the schools. Eighteen months after the Executive Board had approved the investigation, the Committee presented a "Scheme of Efficiency Tests for a Library School," based on the "Test of College Efficiency Prepared by Charles N. Cole of Oberlin College."<sup>41</sup> The "Scheme" made no reference to the standards of 1905 and 1906 but emphasized rather that "the schools should be examined from the point of view of the needs of the profession, not simply from the point of view of the interests of the library schools."

The efficiency test, more thorough than any proposed up to that date, was divided into two parts, "The Process of Education" and "The Testing of School Work in Practical Activity." In Part I, the questions related to the internal administrative functions, such as government and control, equipment, instruction, student life, and work. Probing questions, such as "Do new teachers have a voice in determination of educational questions," and others relating to qualifications, tenure, and estimate of the work of the faculty were included.

From the questions relating to "Practice Work," it seemed that some concern was being expressed over the amount of time allotted to it. Thoughtful answers to the two penetrating questions, "What is the purpose in practice work?" and "Is this purpose realized?" might well have stimulated a reappraisal of the justifications offered. Though the 1906 standards had stated that at least one sixth of the student's time should be given to practical work, no maximal allotment of time was suggested.<sup>42</sup> By such measurement an illusionary conformity had been achieved, whereas the Committee of 1903 had indicated great variations, ranging from 60 hours at Drexel Institute to 468 hours at Pratt Institute.<sup>43</sup> In 1915 even wider variations were evident in a range of from 120 to 464 hours in the one-year programs.<sup>44</sup>

Part II, "The Testing of School Work," if objectively answered, could have added new dimensions of measurement had such questions as these been amplified:

Do the interests of the graduates seem to be broadly professional, or narrowly confined to a particular type of work which they have entered;

What has been the general intellectual standing of the graduates:

Have they shown themselves equal to cope with their opportunities;

.....  
Have they taken influential places in the towns in which they work.

Such questions, of necessity, were to be answered by employers or on the basis of student reports. By recognizing that the success of a

school should be measured by the professional accomplishments of its graduates, the Committee was attempting to fulfill its own objective, "to make an absolutely thorough, and impartial study of the *whole* library school problem." (*Italics mine.*)

Securing a competent person. The securing of a competent person was complicated not only by the financial limitations imposed by the Executive Board but by the requirements of the Committee that the examiner be a graduate of a library school; that she have had experience in a library; that she have had, if possible, some teaching experience in a library school.<sup>45</sup> Three candidates were found possessing the qualification, the first two of whom declined—Harriet Price Sawyer,<sup>46</sup> principal of the Training Class of the St. Louis Public Library, and June Richardson Donnelly, formerly of the Drexel Institute Library School.<sup>47</sup> The third candidate, Mary Esther Robbins, a graduate of the New York State Library School, formerly associated with the Simmons College Library School,<sup>48</sup> accepted.

#### *Purpose of the examination*

On February 6, 1914, the library schools were informed of the examination with the explanation:

We were urged to do this by the library schools themselves as well as by many members of the profession, who felt that the committee ought to be able to give a list of approved schools whose work had been examined by the committee and found to be such that it could be recommended as an approved school by the A.L.A.

The threefold plan of procedure was identified: (1) the careful examining of those schools desiring to be examined; (2) the obtaining from librarians, through correspondence, their opinions on the success and limitations of the graduates; (3) the securing of opinions from graduates concerning the valuable and least valuable aspects of the library school curricula.

Though Root had refrained from actually promising that the Committee would issue a list of schools in the communication of February 6, 1914, he later acknowledged that there was some doubt as to the wisdom of submitting such a list.<sup>49</sup> This warning or precautionary statement, plus the lack of assurance in the February letter, was the first indication that the Committee had not planned all along to submit a list of schools which were approved or accredited. The admission of uncertainty of purpose marked the denouement of what was to have been a consequential performance. Confusion concerning the purpose was further confounded when, in December, 1915, after the investigation had been completed, Root announced that the Committee's object had been "to satisfy itself if the standards published in 1905 and 1906 were being maintained."<sup>50</sup> He offered no explanation of the grandly devised "Scheme of Efficiency Tests for a Library School," which the Committee had accepted as a basis for the investigation or to the implication of the 1906



report that even as of that date the standards would have to be raised before any of the schools examined could fall appreciably below them.

*The examination and its subsequent negation*

Presumably all the schools offering at least one full year's program were visited, though only two were ever identified by name—the new school at the California State Library, which offered its first year's program in 1914, and the Simmons College Library School.<sup>51</sup> Neither the conclusions of the examination nor the raw materials on which they were based were ever made available.

**Two recommendations.** Only two recommendations for improvement were quoted in the 1915 report of the Committee on Library Training.<sup>52</sup> The first recommendation, that the work of the two-year schools should be so arranged that students completing approved one-year programs could receive credit at a two-year school for the first year, was viewed by the library schools as being more or less in effect. Miss Plummer implied that the articulation of the one- and two-year programs was an actuality, though some problems were still evident, and stated that generally the schools had found the substance in the first year of the two-year programs was similar to that of the one-year schools.<sup>53</sup>

The second recommendation, which received little attention, was that special technical courses should be offered to advanced workers with a foundation of the essentials of general training and experience. In making it, however, Miss Robbins seemed motivated by the same fundamental consideration as that which was to guide Williamson in his proposal for the organization of specialized training. He was to state more specifically than had Miss Robbins: "Between the year of general study and the period of special training at least one year of first-class library experience should be required."<sup>54</sup>

**Raw materials of the study.** The raw materials of the examination were never fully evaluated, for the Committee on Library Training transferred the material to Harold O. Rugg, of the School of Education, University of Chicago, who had, on his initiative, offered to make a survey of education for library training.<sup>55</sup> The Committee approved the transfer, confident that Rugg, who had been unaware of the Committee's efforts, would make contributions from a strictly pedagogical point of view.<sup>56</sup> Unfortunately Rugg never undertook the survey which he had so persuasively proposed.<sup>57</sup> Thus the raw materials of the first financially sponsored investigation of library schools lay unanalyzed and, except for the brief reference to the data in the 1916 Committee report, ignored.

**Final reference to the examination.** In 1916 the Committee informed the American Library Association with finality that

it seems apparent from the examination that all the schools are fairly meeting the requirements laid down by the Committee in

1905 and 1906 as a minimum standard. In many cases these are very considerably exceeded.<sup>58</sup>

The decision, a mere repetition of the conclusion reached in 1906, minus the names of the schools, implied that the efficiency tests had never been seriously considered. It completely repudiated the work of the Committee, which had been dedicated presumably, since 1908, to the task of examining and publishing a list of approved library schools.

If the American Library Association regretted the allocation of \$400 for an examination of library schools which, when presented, was totally ineffectual and meaningless, no statement to that effect was made during the Conference of 1916. No comment of any kind has been recorded in the *Proceedings*. It was as if nothing had happened, for no recommendations were made concerning the future of the schools.

#### The Committee and the library schools

The cordial relationship between the Committee and the library schools, which had been established when the petition was presented by the latter in 1912, was furthered by the appearance of Root at two of the school meetings. In 1914 he spoke of the impending examination. In 1915 he reported on "Some Criticisms of Library Schools Received by the A.L.A. Committee," but despite requests from the schools for identification of the individual schools referred to, Root did not violate his pledge of confidence made to his respondents.<sup>59</sup> Though the identifications were never made, the Committee's willingness to discuss an aspect of the report with a group independent of the American Library Association, and before making a report to the Association, implied a recognition of the potential development of the group and of its responsibilities.

Even while the Committee was completing its examination, the schools had formalized their round table gatherings into an Association of American Library Schools. The Association had not adhered, however, to the 1906 standards in defining its own membership requirements. Whereas the 1906 standards specified the entrance requirements as being three years beyond high school or an entrance examination in specified topics, the Association accepted for membership those schools requiring for entrance a four-year high school course or its equivalent.<sup>60</sup> Though Root expressed difficulty in accepting as an ultimate standard one which involved simply the equivalent of preparation for college, he assured the Association:

I am looking quite as much, perhaps more, to results which are worked out in the directions of standards by this Association of American Library Schools as I am to anything that an outside committee like the A.L.A. committee on library training can ever possibly do. About all that committee can ever possibly do is now and then set up standards which seem to be at least the minimum standards that can be required.<sup>61</sup>

As if emphasizing the recognition of the Association as the body more directly responsible for the library schools, Root outlined the future work of the Committee. The work included the examination, by members of the Committee rather than by a salaried examiner, of apprentice classes in the larger libraries, instruction in library training in normal schools, work in colleges and universities other than those maintaining regular library schools, and summer courses in library training.<sup>62</sup> The plans did not include any future discussion of the need to modify or extend the minimum standards of 1906. Not only did the Committee appear to be confirming its awareness of the ultimate ineffectuality of its examination, but, more, it was tending to abrogate its responsibilities in regard to formulating standards. When advised, through the 1916 report, the American Library Association accepted without comment the implication that the scope of the new inquiries omitted a continuing review of the library schools.

The Committee kept itself informed on the activities of the Association of American Library Schools because its members were invited to attend the meetings which were usually held during meetings of the American Library Association. Because of the independent status of the Association of American Library Schools, it was through the Committee, if at all, that information was channeled to the American Library Association since the schools themselves made no report.<sup>63</sup>

#### ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LIBRARY SCHOOLS: ITS STANDARDS

The Association standards, as originally stated, restricted membership to those schools: (1) requiring for entrance a four-year high school course or its equivalent; (2) offering at least a full academic year (not less than 34 weeks) of technical and professional library courses; (3) preparing for general work in the profession rather than for positions in a specific library; (4) having a faculty of at least two full-time instructors; (5) having at least two faculty members with one year of training in a library school.<sup>64</sup> The Association had lowered its entrance requirements from those recommended in the standards of 1906, which had called for three years beyond high school, or an entrance examination in specified topics. The faculty requirements, though less rigid than those of 1906, were later amended to admit a school "whose faculty *shall aggregate* at least two full-time instructors."<sup>65</sup> (*Italics mine.*)

It was by compromise finally rather than by merit that certain schools were admitted, for when it was learned that four of the ten members of the Round Table were not eligible, according to the original constitution, all were admitted as charter members. The four schools not meeting the requirements were the New York Public Library School, the Western Reserve University Library School, and the schools in Pittsburgh and Atlanta. The six which were eligible were the New York State Library School, Illinois, Pratt, Simmons, Syracuse, and Wisconsin.<sup>66</sup>

The Association maintained a continuing and self-conscious interest in its admission requirements, however, and by 1919 incorporated into the constitution more provisions, such as approval by a two-thirds vote of all members.<sup>67</sup> When in 1920 the Committee on Library Training accepted temporarily the standards which the Association had formulated,<sup>68</sup> the 1906 standards were officially nullified. Yet the action did not indicate a complete recapitulation but rather, as will be shown, a strategic move taken by the Committee to rescind the assurance, if it may be so described, extended in 1916 that the determination of standards was properly a function of the Association of American Library Schools.

When in 1923 the Association admitted that "the loose organization... and the very low minima of... requirements make difficult any effective effort to elevate standards,"<sup>69</sup> it was acknowledging that it had been no more successful than had been the Committee on Library Training. For the elevating and enforcing of standards both the schools and the profession were, in the future, to look elsewhere.

#### CONTINUING CRITICISMS, 1915-19

In contrast to the mild objection made to the formation of the Association of American Library Schools by Mary Fileen Ahern, who expressed concern lest the Association develop into a "mutual admiration society,"<sup>70</sup> devastatingly critical remarks were being made of the graduates of the schools. One such accusation prompted Miss Donnelly, a library school director, to protest against hostile criticisms delivered anonymously.<sup>71</sup> She cited particularly "A Wail of Despair," which charged, without substantiation:

It was the combination of crass ignorance about elementary things—accessioning—accuracy in cataloging—of course they did not know our subjects—but they made no attempt to learn our catalogs. Their total lack of appreciation of the *book* and their utter insubordination, want of will in discipline was most trying. They were not worth a dollar a day, not so much to us as our sewing girl I have taken in from the binding room and who is now working up in the library. They did not know enough to know how ignorant they were of *common* things.<sup>72</sup>

A similarly antagonistic view was expressed by Adelaide R. Hasse, who proclaimed:

The graduates of the library schools of to-day, I maintain, stop learning when they leave school. I am speaking of the average, of course. Many below the average have never begun to learn. To attend lectures, even to pass an examination does not necessarily imply the possession of the learning mind.<sup>73</sup>

The prevalence of the low opinion of the graduates was acknowledged by J. H. Friedel, the editor of *Special Libraries*.<sup>74</sup> While stating that he

did not endorse the view that librarians were not equal to their predecessors, he added:

But if it can be said, as it is, by public librarians and heads of library commissions whose views we respect, who universally favor employment of and are in continued contact with the library school graduate, it does not speak creditably of the library schools.<sup>75</sup>

His major criticism of the library school was its emphasis on technique rather than method, with emphasis on memory rather than ability to cope with new situations. In support of that view, Friedel cited the graduate's inability to create a special classification scheme for a particular need.

#### Protest from the Committee on Library Training

The Committee on Library Training, aware of the turbulence, officially protested in 1918 against the critics of the schools and the graduates. Scorning the tendency of the critics to generalize from individual cases, the Committee noted the dependence of the schools on librarians for their recommendations, which, in contrast, were almost always exceedingly favorable. The Committee offered as an alternative that

absolute honesty on the part of librarians in recommending candidates to the schools, and adequate compensation to attract people of cultivation and intellectual capacity will do more to solve the problem than any radical reorganization of library school methods.<sup>76</sup>

In 1919 the Committee was silent, for under its chairman, Andrew Keogh, no action was taken and no report made to the American Library Association.

#### Apparent indifference of the schools

Though the library schools were given an opportunity in *Public Libraries* "to discuss anything which might seem to them to make clearer the aims of the school or that needed emphasis,"<sup>77</sup> only six schools responded: Los Angeles Public Library, Pratt Institute Library School, Riverside Library Service School, St. Louis Library School, Simmons College, and Syracuse University.<sup>78</sup> Miss Ahern, in expressing her disappointment that all had not co-operated, reported that "excuses like unto those sent to the master of the wedding feast came from others."

Largely factual and descriptive, the views were on the whole lusterless and uninspired except for the comments from the nonconforming Joseph F. Daniels of the Riverside School.<sup>79</sup> He depicted a novel experience awaiting one in an atmosphere where there would be no examinations, for, according to Daniels, examinations "after entering school are unnecessary, incompetent and a shameful waste." He noted further the absence of recitations and classrooms, the leaves of absence taken by the faculty for practical experience. With such a plan, one could "escape conventionalized study courses and the academic prejudice."

The only surprising bit of information revealed about the older library schools was Miss Rathbone's practice<sup>80</sup>—and consequent open invitation to high school graduates—of not limiting admission at Pratt to college graduates because of her desire to admit an exceptional student not academically qualified. In support of her view, she quoted a college graduate as having chosen Pratt instead of a graduate school "because I have been associating with college men and women for four years and I wanted to be thrown with some other kind of people."

Though Miss Ahern's enigmatic evaluation had been that "the replies show pretty plainly the fiber of the various schools responding," the experience offered disturbing evidence that the schools were indifferent to publicity and an opportunity to clarify issues at a time when they were under critical surveillance. The action was thoroughly indicative that the fibers needed strengthening. In contrast to the non-communicative schools, the critics continued unabatedly to express their views.

#### Criticisms concerning the faculties of library schools

Not only were the students criticized for their limitations, but faculty qualifications were reviewed and oftentimes the faculty were found wanting. W. E. Henry, librarian of the University of Washington, cited the qualifications as being: (1) knowledge of subject matter; (2) possession of an intense human interest in the subject; (3) power to organize material; (4) power to inspire. While he did not identify anyone possessing those traits, he contended that the best library school teachers "are among those who insist upon giving most of their time to actual practice in the profession, but are willing to give part time service to teaching."<sup>81</sup>

Criticism came from an unexpected source in 1919, from Chalmers Hadley, president of the American Library Association, who found two faults with teaching: (1) need of pedagogical training and (2) need of teachers to return to regular library work at intervals.<sup>82</sup> Neither thought was original, but inevitably a certain prestige was added to them because of his position.

A severe indictment emanated from the Pacific Northwest Library Association, which went on record in 1919 as recommending that "there may be a reorganization of the teaching force in accredited schools, which shall demand that the teachers possess some knowledge of pedagogical methods and that they shall be in reasonably close touch with actual progressive library work."<sup>83</sup> Windsor, of the University of Illinois, objected to the intent of the Pacific Northwest resolutions, which were later discussed at the meeting of the Section on Professional Training in 1920.<sup>84</sup> He informed Zulema Kostomlatsky, who had made the speech:

I think the time has come for criticism of particular schools rather than condemning them as a class, because I know the schools differ very much and criticisms which are aimed at some schools may not necessarily apply at all to some of the others.<sup>85</sup>

He wisely concluded, with little avail, "The profession as a whole does not gain by discrediting in wholesale fashion the principal agencies for its own professional training."

### Defense by W. E. Henry of the University of Washington

In the midst of the animadversions which were weakening the confidence of the profession, both in the library schools and in the graduates, W. E. Henry, having viewed the qualifications of the faculty, offered a sound defense of "Librarianship as a Profession."<sup>86</sup> After observing that, as each profession moved toward professionalism, it created and sustained its training institutions for the preparation of its members, he sanctioned library school training as the only legitimate entrance to the profession. He rejected apprenticeship training as suitable only for the trades.

Answering the rhetorical question, "Whom shall we train," Henry would not have approved any training other than "four years above the high school graduation [i.e., three years of college plus the year of professional training] or its equivalent in travel or reading, or home environment or in library service." Should any change be permitted, Henry would have consented only to an increase—that training must be built upon college graduation or its equivalent.

He attempted also to distinguish between professional and clerical services and was particularly adamant that a distinction be not only made but publicized. He emphasized that

if we must have cheaper helpers they must know and the public must know that they are not librarians. Charging out a book is no more a part of librarianship than the bookkeeping by the physician's office girl is of the profession of medicine.

Henry advanced three proposals for furthering professional training: (1) the adoption of a plan similar to that found in the educational world, which offers competitive examinations and issues temporary licenses to be made permanent upon evidence of improvement; (2) creation of clerical positions, from which one could not be promoted "without final and high grade preparation," but in which no one could remain permanently; and (3) the establishment of schools in response to demands.

Having proclaimed his unequivocal stand that formal training was a measure of professionalism, Henry fulfilled in part the third of his proposals when he participated in transforming the program at the University from a four-year to a five-year school, "the first three being devoted entirely to liberal arts and science subjects, library economy beginning in the fourth year and continuing thruout the fifth."<sup>87</sup>

### Final proposal by Aksel G. S. Josephson

Though Josephson's original plan for bibliographic training was never adopted, he, too, during the hostile years, evolved another scheme. In 1917, twenty-one years after his earliest criticism, he urged again

the "absolute necessity of the establishment by some university of a course in bibliography and library administration for library school graduates and for graduate students in general."

After expressing the rather poignant hope that his outline for such a course would "come under the sympathetic eyes of someone in authority," he projected a plan for which, after six years of study, a Master's degree would be offered.<sup>88</sup> It differed from his 1900 idea in that he was structuring library training on a foundation of three years of college, in contrast to the "Junior Program" of 1900, which had as an admission requirement graduation from a high school. He also omitted any reference to a Ph.D. degree. His plan was as follows:

1. A four year college course leading to the B.A. degree  
First-Third years: general courses in the liberal arts and sciences  
Fourth year: subjects directly connected with library work, preceded by a brief course in the history of libraries and with one on books running throughout the whole year  
minor branches of library technique: acquisition, circulation, ordering records, as practice work at end of the year  
preparation of a brief bibliography or reference list on subject assigned by the faculty
2. A two year graduate course leading to the M.A. degree  
First year: advanced and comparative studies of the fourth year subjects  
courses on the principles of library administration, history of printing and the book trade and graphic arts  
Second year: special bibliography, paleography, history of museums and other institutions of learning, continuing the study of the history of science and industry  
preparation of a thesis on a subject selected by the student and accompanied by an annotated bibliography

Josephson suggested the adoption of the seminar method as a mode of study, with emphasis being placed on the theoretical and historical aspects with adequate but minimal practice work. His concern over establishing such a program was not shared by his contemporaries, nor did a sympathetic eye view it. His plan appears to have been ignored by Williamson; in addition, there is no evidence that Williamson ever consulted with Josephson or weighed the merits of his concept of 1917.

### Criticism from an outside agency

Meanwhile from outside the field, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which had fostered the building of libraries, viewed with concern the evidence that the libraries were offering inadequate service. As a possible solution it turned its attention to the training programs, four of which had received financial assistance, because the inadequate and incompetent quality of service was denigrating the intent of Andrew Carnegie's purposeful philosophy.



## Training as viewed by an outside agency: the Carnegie Corporation of New York

INQUIRY BY

THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION, 1915-16

As the Carnegie Corporation became increasingly aware that the proliferation of Carnegie buildings was leading to a serious problem of ineffectual service, it undertook to review its policy of donations. By that policy a community could fulfill the minimal requirements of the "Letter of Promise" exchanged between Andrew Carnegie and itself if it allocated 10 per cent of the cost of the building for maintenance.<sup>1</sup> Since out of 1,317 libraries built, 80 per cent or 1,048 cost less than \$10,000, such fulfillment implied an allocation of \$1,000, from which the librarian's salary, library materials, and maintenance charges were budgeted.<sup>2</sup> When informed in 1915 by the League of Library Commissions that the 10 per cent clause had been detrimental to complacent communities,<sup>3</sup> the Corporation, hesitant to alter the "Letter of Promise," authorized Alvin Saunders Johnson to study the results of the wide provision of free library buildings and also to *inquire into library schools and the adequacy of the output of trained librarians*.<sup>4</sup>

### The Johnson Report... on the Policy of Donations to Free Public Libraries

Johnson submitted his *Report*<sup>5</sup> in 1916 with the recommendation that the Carnegie Corporation continue its policy of donations guided by certain principles of "philanthropic intervention" which he advanced. The recommendation was rejected by the Corporation, however, for in 1917 the Corporation discontinued its practice of making grants for the erection of buildings.<sup>6</sup> The *Report* was not totally ineffectual, for Johnson directed his attention also to a program wherein the Corporation would shift its emphasis to library service and to the promotion of a broader concept of library training.

From his survey of library personnel, only a dismal picture emerged; Johnson cited particularly the fact that in many instances training had been regarded as secondary to other qualifications, such as "local, social and political standing," and observed that "if the chief librarian is of indifferent quality—not an uncommon case—the home-bred stuff reflects all her weaknesses."<sup>7</sup> His convictions concerning

the limitations of the "untrained and unintelligent librarian" were strengthened by his own survey of facilities for library training. He unhesitatingly stated that of the thirteen institutions offering professional training, only seven were of much importance; those he identified as being three in New York, one in Massachusetts, one in Pennsylvania, one in Wisconsin, and one in Illinois.

Two weaknesses in the programs were cited as being: (1) the expenditure of time on technical subjects at the expense of emphasizing the reading interests of a community; (2) the adaptation of the training to the needs of large libraries rather than to the work of the smaller libraries of the Carnegie type. Johnson deplored the emphasis on technical training, not in itself, but in that it was, according to many entrance requirements, superimposed upon a high school education. He expressed also his skepticism concerning the combination of a college course with one year of professional training, which was part of the plan proposed by Josephson in his 1917 outline.

Johnson did not advocate, as did Williamson later, that the minimal entrance requirement to library schools be a college degree, though he had freely expressed doubt concerning admission of high school graduates and even of the combination four-year program. Within the confines of his assignment, he proposed that the Corporation, working through state library commissions, foster the establishment "in a number of state universities of combined academic and professional library courses."

Convinced that the Corporation might properly take measures to increase the number of persons trained, he offered four recommendations: (1) to create a program of scholarships in established library schools; (2) to subsidize summer library courses in universities for librarians of small libraries; (3) to assist existing library schools to increase their facilities or encourage certain institutions to undertake library instruction; (4) to exert influence on training, shifting the emphasis from buildings to service.

Both by the recommendations cited and by the policies on donations, codified by Johnson, was the Corporation advised to enlarge its policy to include a broader conception of library training. It was not until March 11, 1918, that the Corporation announced its intention of inquiring further into the subject of library training. In that year, appended to the appropriation for the New York Public Library School, was the statement that the Board of Trustees had "in view an inquiry into the subject of schools for training."<sup>8</sup>

The major contribution of the Johnson *Report* lay, then, in its bringing the matter of training specifically to the attention of the Corporation. Otherwise its recommendations were neglected. Williamson later criticized the report as containing "nothing particularly new to the library profession" and concluded that

many of his observations as to conditions and needs are pertinent and valuable, but his suggestions as to methods for improvement

and extension of training facilities were either very general or of questionable practicability.<sup>9</sup>

#### PLANS FOR A SECOND INQUIRY BY THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION

Confronted with the assignment of March, 1918, James Bertram, secretary of the Carnegie Corporation, obtained the aid and advice of Charles Clarence Williamson, who had been appointed to serve as statistician for the Study of Methods of Americanization, a project being sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation. He was, in addition, librarian of the Municipal Reference Library in New York City and president of the Special Libraries Association.<sup>10</sup> Bertram requested Williamson to perform two preliminary tasks before the study of library training was undertaken officially: (1) to confer with representative librarians concerning the study, and (2) to offer some suggestions for the education of the unprofessional librarian. Both tasks Williamson performed promptly, the first by attending the Saratoga Conference of the American Library Association; the second, by his contribution, "The Need of a Plan for Library Development."

#### Williamson at the Saratoga Springs Conference, 1918

During the Conference, Williamson conferred with sixteen individuals concerning an investigation on training for library work, *particularly for the small libraries*, and also for the purpose of compiling a list of persons who might serve on a committee to make the investigation. The persons consulted, grouped according to library affiliations, represented the library schools, the American Library Association, library commissions, state libraries, public libraries, college libraries, the Library Bureau, the publisher of library indexes, and a library organizer. They may be identified according to their affiliations:

##### Library school directors, etc.

Sarah C. N. Bogle, Carnegie Library School

Mary E. Hazeltine, University of Wisconsin

Josephine A. Rathbone, Pratt Institute Library School

Ernest J. Reece, New York Public Library School

Frank K. Walter, New York State Library School

##### American Library Association

George B. Utley, secretary

##### Library commissions

Matthew S. Dudgeon, secretary, Wisconsin Free Library Commission

William J. Hamilton, secretary, Indiana Public Library Commission

##### State libraries

W. R. Watson, State Library, New York

##### Public libraries

Edwin H. Anderson, director, New York Public Library

Linda Eastman, vice-librarian, Cleveland Public Library  
Chalmers Hadley, librarian, Denver Public Library  
College libraries  
Azariah Smith Root, librarian, Oberlin College  
The Library Bureau  
H. R. Datz, manager  
Publisher of indexes  
H. W. Wilson  
Library organizer  
Mary E. Downey, Utah<sup>11</sup> (also director of the Chautauqua  
Summer School for Librarians)

Significantly omitted from the list is the name of Mary E. Robbins, who had conducted the examination of library schools for the Committee on Library Training. Though the Committee on Library Training was the officially designated committee of the Association concerned with the problems of training, Williamson did not seek the opinion of that body. Of the individuals interviewed, two were members, but membership seemed accidental since also present were four others not consulted.<sup>12</sup> Though he spoke with five library school directors, Williamson did not consult them as members of the Association of American Library Schools, of which Miss Bogle was immediate past president. He did not interview the newly appointed president, Alice S. Tyler, of Western Reserve University Library School, who was present at the Conference.

### *Comments on training during the Conference*

Though the Conference was being held during World War I, the hopeful view toward training, as expressed in the Professional Training Section, was that training for a permanent profession should not be modified to fit the conditions of a temporary catastrophe. During that catastrophe, however, Frank K. Walter anticipated two certain inevitable changes in the future of library training and service: (1) the extension of training to all grades of library service with a consequent division of library services into clerical and professional, and (2) the ultimate acceptance of definite standards of library service leading perhaps to certification and standardization of library services.<sup>13</sup>

Both the Section and the Committee on Library Training discussed with some fervor the problems of recruitment and salary. The Section appointed a committee to make a survey of the salary conditions and their relation to the problem of effective training.<sup>14</sup> The Committee, after informing the Association that the Association of American Library Schools recognized also that inadequate compensation was a deterrent to advances in library training, viewed the problem as one for the profession at large to consider, if it desired to see the standards of training advanced.<sup>15</sup> Williamson, however, was less concerned in 1918 with the problem of increasing compensation than he was with the fact that the library schools were "not attempting to fit students for part time positions paying \$30 to \$50 a month."<sup>16</sup>

### Williamson's report to Bertram

Williamson made a prompt report to Bertram on the results of his Saratoga mission, summarizing his encounters with individuals and suggesting names of individuals who might participate in the investigation. Notably lacking from his "Memorandum of July 6, 1918,"<sup>17</sup> were references to the Committee on Library Training, the Section on Professional Training, and the Association of American Library Schools. Of the possible results of his consultation, two may be cited: (1) the opportunity provided Williamson for acquainting himself further with the problems and personalities in the field; (2) the informal indication given to the library profession of the interest of the Carnegie Corporation in the problem of training. His thoughtful reporting on possible members of a committee to investigate the training programs was invalidated when on March 28, 1919, the Trustees of the Corporation appointed him director of the study.<sup>18</sup> He had, however, during the interim, published his views on training in the *Library Journal*.

### WILLIAMSON AND "THE NEED OF A PLAN"

Williamson's "The Need of a Plan for Library Development"<sup>19</sup> was in essence a warning to the library profession that it was failing in its provision of service, particularly in the small Carnegie libraries, and also in its provision of training for librarians of small libraries. He further warned that the responsibility for improvement or advances rested squarely upon the profession and proposed that the American Library Association "assume the duty of working out some plan of professional education that would be adequate for the needs of every branch of library service." He enumerated the agencies of training, noting the services of the state library commissions, summer schools, and library institutes. Of the existing library schools, he observed that: (1) they were not preparing students for part-time positions paying from \$30 to \$50 a month; (2) library school facilities were not adequate to meet the need for trained personnel in the higher ranks; (3) existing schools were doing good work, though perhaps the courses were not flexible enough for the great diversity of requirements in the positions which the graduates accepted; (4) the capacity of the schools was not equal to the demand.

### Williamson's suggestions for improvement

Within the context of Williamson's analysis of the need of a plan for library development were three suggestions, not one of which was totally new but in only one of which did Williamson acknowledge the existence of prior professional consideration. His suggestions pertained to: (1) a graduate school; (2) correspondence courses; (3) the establishment of an agency to co-ordinate the varied training programs in existence.

*Concerning a graduate school*

Melvil Dewey, as early as 1888, had proposed a postgraduate course.<sup>20</sup> Not only had Aksel G. S. Josephson advocated in his "Preparation for Librarianship" the organization of an "independent post-graduate university course, in connection with some university,"<sup>21</sup> but he had in 1917, only fifteen months before Williamson's proposals appeared, urged again "the absolute necessity of the establishment by some university of a course in bibliography and library administration."<sup>22</sup>

Yet Williamson made no reference to the earlier proposals; he simply offered the following thought:

I have wondered whether it would be possible or desirable to establish a purely graduate school of very high order, to which only graduates of other schools or those with equivalent training and some successful experience would be admitted. This would enable existing schools and the others we shall need to confine their energies to the fundamental things that every grade of service requires. A graduate school, especially if conducted as a part of a university, could afford more specialized work than can be expected of any existing school.<sup>23</sup>

*Concerning correspondence courses*

Having viewed the various types of training available to the librarian of the small library, Williamson proposed another—the adaptation of the correspondence method of instruction. In recommending this type of minimal training, Williamson was again repeating a proposal made by Melvil Dewey in 1888,<sup>24</sup> but he acknowledged that he had learned that "Melvil Dewey, many years ago, believed a correspondence course feasible and wished the Albany school to become the pioneer in establishing one."

He failed, however, to make references to the reports of the Committee on Library Training, which would have given more up-to-date information and would have indicated that the schools were not unaware of correspondence instruction. The reports, while indicating a vacillating policy, nevertheless would have shown that in 1903 the Committee recommended that some of the established schools and/or leading libraries be authorized by the Association to offer correspondence work; that the 1905 Standards of Library Training failed to define standards for correspondence work; that in 1906 the Committee decided to suggest no standards or regulations; that in 1907 the Committee had commented unfavorably on the program being offered by the International Correspondence University.<sup>25</sup>

*Concerning the establishment of an agency*

In viewing the diversity of the training agencies, Williamson recognized the need to co-ordinate the training programs being offered or to be offered and proposed, consequently, the creation of

some central organization, a library service bureau perhaps, under the management of a board chosen by the [state library] commissions and existing professional organizations, [which] should work out the plans and supervise their execution, assigning to each agency the tasks it is fitted to undertake.<sup>26</sup>

The proposal might well have been related to the premature plan, proposed by William H. Brett in 1898, which would have unified, in effect, the various training agencies through its program of examination and awarding of degrees and diplomas.<sup>27</sup> Within Williamson's proposal, however, lay the germinal seed for his advocacy of an American Library Association training board, about which he was to speak in 1919.

### Reception of Williamson's "The Need of a Plan" and of the proposed study

Williamson's public exploration of training needs brought forth only a brief editorial comment in the *Library Journal*, which identified the thoughts as being similar to those of James Bertram.<sup>28</sup> The association of Bertram's ideas with those of Williamson was apparently accidental, for no hint was given that the Corporation study was being considered. Yet it was accurate editorializing, for Bertram stated in the *Memorandum*, which he prepared for the Corporation, that the paper included "most of the points upon which he and the writer found themselves agreed."<sup>29</sup>

### *By the Association of American Library Schools*

The Association of American Library Schools responded to Williamson's "Need of a Plan" by inviting him to address its meeting of March, 1919, "on certain suggestions that he had already made regarding training."<sup>30</sup> Though he was unable to attend the meeting, he did inform the Association, in a letter to Alice S. Tyler, president, that the Carnegie Corporation was contemplating making a study of training for library work.

Discussion by Sarah C. N. Bogle of "The Plan." Within the Association it was Sarah C. N. Bogle who urged that Williamson's article be given "earnest and sincere attention." After admitting that a first reading "leaves one a bit bewildered between pessimistic recognition of truth and optimistic reaction,"<sup>31</sup> Miss Bogle reacted optimistically, and expanded Williamson's proposal for a centralized board or some centralized organization functioning as a co-ordinating agency. Her plan called for a Centralized Controlling Board composed of the following existing agencies: A.L.A. Committee on Professional Training; Association of American Library Schools; League of Library Commissions; A.L.A. Council; and the profession at large or Trustees Section of A.L.A. According to Miss Bogle's scheme, the Board would administer an extension or correspondence program, to which admission requirements would be not less than four years' high school, an examination set by

the board, and practice work; would select the faculty and provide aids such as a centralized but transportable collection of books and exhibits; would provide for a follow-up system, such as visits from Headquarters and from state commissions; would plan institutes and provide practice work.<sup>32</sup>

No definite action was taken by the Association on Miss Bogle's plan, either to approve it or to have it transmitted to Williamson as a positive acceptance of his challenge that "the responsibility for every advance rests squarely upon the profession and cannot be shifted,"<sup>33</sup> or as evidence that the Association also recognized that the problem of the small library was unquestionably "one of the most difficult and important ones in the whole range of library service."<sup>34</sup> On her own initiative, however, Miss Bogle forwarded to Williamson on March 31, 1919, a typewritten copy of the informal notes from which she had spoken.<sup>35</sup>

Concerning correspondence courses. Because of Williamson's emphasis on correspondence courses as the solution to the training problems of the small library, the Association discussed the advisability of offering training through such a method. While recognizing also that students could not justifiably accept positions for \$30 or \$40 a month after spending time and money on one or two years of library school training, the Association offered no positive program. Instead it delimited its perspective on the issue to deterring factors such as: (1) the inability of any one school to offer the courses and the consequent necessity of the program's being a co-operative affair; (2) the lack of suitable textbooks;<sup>36</sup> (3) the problem of credits for correspondence work; (4) the offering of short courses within the longer courses for those interested in working in small public libraries.<sup>37</sup> Though the schools acknowledged that only through co-operative action could an adequate correspondence program be offered, no action was taken nor was Williamson informed that the matter had been discussed. It was simply suggested that the Association "record its welcoming attitude toward a plan of correspondence instruction carried on by the various agencies for library training."<sup>38</sup>

Response to the proposed Carnegie Corporation study. The Association was informed of the proposed study eight months after the Saratoga Springs Conference. Because the information was contained in the letter from Williamson stating that he could not speak at the meeting of March 8, 1919,<sup>39</sup> it would appear that only in the most informal manner was the Association notified of the impending study. Though there was some confusion among the members present as to the status of the study, one misconception being that Williamson had already made a preliminary survey, only one of the five library school representatives whom Williamson had interviewed offered any clarification.<sup>40</sup>

Some assurance was offered by Frank K. Walter, with whom Williamson had been in correspondence, that the study was not to be made in an effort to criticize but rather to offer, on the basis of the facts collected, constructive recommendations. In spite of the assurance, the



atmosphere was permeated with uncertainty as to the real purpose of the survey, Williamson's association with the Corporation, and the status of the survey itself. Under such conditions, the Association can only be commended for voting to "authorize the president to coöperate in any study of training for library work, to represent the Association in conference or by correspondence, or to appoint a committee if it seemed desirable."<sup>41</sup> What the Association had overlooked was that Williamson had been informing it of the study, not attempting to secure any promise of co-operation.

#### After Williamson's appointment to direct the study

Further references to Williamson's preparation for the Corporation study, and analyses of the original report with its recommendations and of the published report, lie beyond the scope of this paper. It is sufficient to report that Williamson probably completed his visit to the schools, in which he held conferences with directors and principals, by June, 1921;<sup>42</sup> that on February 3, 1922, the Advisory Committee for the study reviewed his summary entitled "Training for Library Work" and accompanying documents;<sup>43</sup> that on March 30, 1922, he was informed by the Advisory Committee that his report had been forwarded to the Corporation.<sup>44</sup>

It has been necessary to consider the *Johnson Report*, and the preliminary plans relating to the second inquiry by the Corporation, in order to view in some perspective the sudden emergence of Williamson as a masterly spokesman in the field of library training. His activities which are pertinent to this study are those which initiated and furthered the concept of a library training board. It is with those only that the final chapter will be concerned.

## Toward a Library Training Board

PROPOSAL BY C. C. WILLIAMSON  
IN 1919

While Williamson had speculated in 1918 on the creation of some central organization to co-ordinate the various training programs, he had conceived by 1920 the idea of a more authoritative agency. Before his appointment to direct the Corporation study, he had been appointed a member of the Committee of Five of the American Library Association "to make a general survey of American library service, particularly in view of the post-war conditions of readjustment," by the Executive Board on January 11, 1919.<sup>1</sup> In the distribution of duties among the members, Williamson was assigned the division

embracing the formation, training, control and welfare of the library staff [which] will include education and training; employment problems, such as selection, civil service control, efficiency ratings, promotion and discipline; salaries, grades and certification; welfare problems, working conditions, hours, vacations, pensions, staff associations and unions; and problems of status, especially those affecting the academic rank of librarians in educational institutions and the rating of the library as compared with other departments of a school or college.<sup>2</sup>

The comprehensive scope of the assignment, in addition to his later appointment to direct the Corporation study, focused Williamson's attention increasingly on the problems of training. It was at the Asbury Park Conference of 1919 that he proposed, for serious thought and action,

the organization of all training activities and facilities into one system under the general direction of an A.L.A. Training Board, with a permanent staff and a competent expert as its executive, and empowered to work out and adopt a scheme of standards of fitness for all grades of library service and to grant appropriate certificates to properly qualified persons.<sup>3</sup>

He delineated the three major functions as being: (1) to formulate a standard scheme of grading library positions in all kinds of professional library work and in the higher grades of clerical service; (2) to

determine minimal standards of training and experience for each grade and to issue certificates therefor; (3) to examine and accredit schools meeting reasonable standards. He envisioned further responsibilities as including the co-ordination, the extension, and the standardization of all types of training agencies; the effecting of a closer co-operation among the schools; and the discovering and developing of skilled instructors in library subjects.<sup>4</sup>

As indicated by function two, certification would be based on training and experience, the higher grades being given to those graduates of schools having membership in the Association of American Library Schools after a minimum period of successful experience, and to those graduates of an accredited training class after a minimum period of experience in a library approved for practice. Lower-grade certificates would be offered for training in summer schools or for courses in library economy in schools and colleges. Anticipating objections to a certification plan, Williamson offered assurances to those already in library service that they "would receive certificates, if they applied for them, corresponding to the grade of work in which they are now successfully engaged, with due regard to general fitness and training."<sup>5</sup>

His approval of certification and his awareness of its desirability were made clear as he spoke of its effects on the individual, who would have definite objectives toward which to strive; on library authorities, who needed guidance in selecting and appointing employees; on the administration, whom it would help in furnishing a basis for gradation of salaries and promotion from grade to grade; on the public, who would begin to recognize library work as a professional activity.

#### Reception of the proposal by the American Library Association

Having secured the support of members of the Association, such as Theresa Hitchler, R. R. Bowker, and W. W. Bishop, the scheme for a Training Board was referred to the Executive Board.<sup>6</sup> The Board, giving the plan immediate attention, voted that it "be approved in general and referred to the [newly created] Committee on an Enlarged Program for American Library Service for early consideration and report."<sup>7</sup> By that action the Board reversed its earlier decision to refrain from making evaluative statements on library training, a policy sustained since the 1910 vote to exclude from the *Handbook* the mere listing of the schools.

#### Response by the Association of American Library Schools

The Association of American Library Schools issued no official statement in regard to the establishment of a Training Board, in spite of its having the approval of the Executive Board of the American Library Association.<sup>8</sup> The reluctance of the Association to consider the impact, or the possible impact, of such a Board on its own activities was not shared, however, by its president, Frank K. Walter, who, in June, 1919, wrote to Williamson, before the Asbury Park Conference,

"I approve thoroughly of the theory of a general A.L.A. Training Board."<sup>9</sup> Yet an inquiry into its continuing existence would have been timely, for, in substantiating the need for a centralized agency, Williamson had viewed the current scene as a hapless one, in which there were more than a half-dozen full-fledged library schools with standards that should be raised. He asserted further that those schools were organized into an association which served somewhat as a co-ordinator but seemed ineffectual to produce any real co-operation.<sup>10</sup>

Williamson seemed increasingly convinced that the library schools were repeating on a small scale the experience of the American medical schools and that, like the latter, the solution for improving standards lay in the creation of an authoritative body, controlled not by the schools but by the profession.<sup>11</sup> Without any evidence other than that offered at Asbury Park, the Association might well have anticipated the evaluative comments which were to appear in Williamson's published report.

#### Reception of the proposal elsewhere

Williamson's proposal was acclaimed by *Public Libraries* as "one of the most important contributions to the general sessions."<sup>12</sup> It was also printed as the lead article in the September, 1919, issue of the *Library Journal*, which was devoted chiefly to training problems. Only one specific reference was made to the proposal, however, and that by Emma V. Baldwin, who approved the plan of certification and the establishment of standards. Both of these she regarded as imperative needs in identifying those who were called "librarians" and in securing adequate salaries.<sup>13</sup> The Pacific Northwest Library Association heartily endorsed the projected plan, which had been transmitted to the Executive Board for action.<sup>14</sup> In contrast to the attitude of the Association of American Library Schools, such endorsement was an extraordinary gesture of confidence in the centralizing aspects inherent in the plan.

#### ACTION WITHIN

#### THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

##### By the Committee on an Enlarged Program

The Committee on an Enlarged Program, laboring under its monumental assignment, part of which was "to submit a further program of new work strong enough to enable the American Library Association to obtain additional funds from other sources,"<sup>15</sup> included as part of that new work the establishment of a National Library Examining Board which would grant certificates. For such a Board the Committee allocated \$10,000 of the money yet to be obtained.

Ignoring the aspects of examining and approving in Williamson's original proposal, the Committee extracted only that pertaining to certification. Its two recommendations specifically detailed:

1. That the Executive Board appoint a National Library Examining Board of three which shall formulate sets of questions,

and at such times as they see fit arrange to submit these questions to candidates for certificates to Grades A, B and C, the grades to be determined by the Examining Board, and the questions to be answered by candidates at such times and places as the Examining Board may determine;

2. That the Examining Board with the approval of the Executive Board shall have authority to grant such certificates without examination to persons holding certificates or diplomas from library schools whose entrance requirements and standards of instruction come up to the necessary standard as set by the Examining Board and approved by the Executive Board.<sup>16</sup>

### *Response of the Committee on Library Training*

In an unprecedented action, the Committee on Library Training, through its chairman, Alice S. Tyler, stated its opposition to the scope of the statement in the Enlarged Program regarding library training. Acknowledging that the Committee endorsed in general the Williamson plan, Miss Tyler objected to the delimited scope, stating that the need was for a board

that will study the whole field and will feel there is some method set forth to articulate the various degrees and kinds of library training, which would include staff and apprentice training, the summer schools, the library schools, and, perchance, the advanced library school, which is much talked of—to create a board of library training.<sup>17</sup>

The Committee, which in 1919 had ignored the events of the Asbury Park Conference, under its new chairman had voted "to give its support to the plan presented to the A.L.A. in a paper by Dr. C. C. Williamson at Asbury Park, for the creation of a National Board of Library Training or Certification."<sup>18</sup> It had not, as Miss Tyler emphasized, approved the plan which was evolved by the Enlarged Committee. The acknowledgment of the Williamson proposal was a proper function of the Committee on Library Training, and the approval of it offered some assurance that the Committee was reasserting itself.

Fully aware that no action had been taken on standards for library schools since the 1916 report, the Committee took the following action as a temporary expedient and as a reassertion of its responsibilities:

Resolved, That pending the establishment of an A.L.A. Board of Library Training or Certification, the Committee recommends the acceptance of the standards established by the Association of American Library Schools as a basis for accrediting such schools.<sup>19</sup>

The decision, which in essence amounted to the approval by the Committee of standards set by a group to evaluate itself and others seeking admission to that group, was in opposition to Williamson's concept that the schools should not set their own standards, but it was tempered by the Committee's approval of the newly proposed agency.

In 1920, then, as Williamson was undertaking his study of library schools, he would have been less than well-informed had he not known that the Committee on Library Training had accepted tentatively the standards of the Association of American Library Schools. Whether Williamson regarded the acceptance as evidence of incompetency is not known, for in his published report, *Training for Library Service*, he made no reference at all to the work of the Committee.

*Schism threatened by the Committee's recommendations*

The apprehension of professional ostracism and the self-consciousness of non-library school graduates were manifested through the Library Workers Association,<sup>20</sup> organized after the report by the Committee on an Enlarged Program. The incentive for organization was objection to the second recommendation, from which it could be inferred that the nongraduate worker would be required to pass an examination even after ten years of successful participation in the field. The new Association declared its intention of having its own committee on credentials, which would offer a test "quite as strenuous as the tests for library school graduation."<sup>21</sup>

The purpose was stated in the Association's constitution, adopted September 23, 1920, as being "to promote the interest of library workers, especially those who had not enjoyed the benefits of library school training." A second practical purpose was the maintenance of an active employment bureau for library workers and libraries.<sup>22</sup> To further the program of the Association, Marian C. Manley accepted the appointment as executive secretary on November 1, 1920.<sup>23</sup>

During its years of rather ineffectual existence, the Association turned its attention to educational matters, notably to the question of correspondence courses, to the correlation of library courses, and to a report on a questionnaire to library schools and to librarians on the questions of training.<sup>24</sup> The chief contribution would appear to be the insistence on the training needs of the non-library school graduate; it seems, moreover, to have contributed to the attitude, which ultimately prevailed, that a plan for certification was not to be acceptable. After its third meeting of June 29, 1922,<sup>25</sup> no further references to the Association appear in library literature; momentarily, however, it had loomed as a schismatic deterrent to the unity of the American Library Association.

By the Committee of Five on Standardization, Certification,  
and Library Training

The Executive Board moved expeditiously to implement the Enlarged Program but, knowing of the dissatisfaction with the proposed National Library Examining Board, concluded that "the appropriate time had not arrived for the appointment of an examining board." Instead the Board voted to authorize the president to "appoint a committee

of five to consider the subjects of standardization, certification and library training." The five members appointed were Frank K. Walter, chairman, A. S. Root, Alice S. Tyler, Adeline B. Zachert, and C. C. Williamson.<sup>26</sup>

At the Colorado Springs Conference, the Committee offered five recommendations to Council:

1. That a National Board of Certification for Librarians be established by the American Library Association and that permanent provision for such a board be incorporated in the constitution of the Association.

2. That this Board shall investigate all existing agencies for teaching library subjects and methods, shall evaluate their work for purposes of certification, shall seek to correlate these agencies into an organized system and to that end shall recommend such new agencies as seem to it desirable and shall establish grades of library service with appropriate certificates. It shall actively cooperate with any official bureau of information or registration established by any of the professional organizations electing or nominating members of the board.

3. That the creation of such a board shall have for one of its purposes the stimulation, thru state and local library commissions or associations, of the improvement of library service and the professional status of library workers. The board shall render these organizations all possible assistance in any such action as is contemplated by them.

4. That, pending constitutional provision for such a board, the Executive Board of the American Library Association be instructed to appoint a special committee of nine members . . .

5. That adequate financial support for this board be provided from funds procured thru the Enlarged Program campaign or otherwise.<sup>27</sup>

The recommendations more nearly approximated the original proposal of Williamson for a library training board, particularly in the inclusion of the responsibility of investigating all training agencies and the issuance of certificates.

Council voted to adopt recommendations two, three, and four, and to accept the report as a whole.<sup>28</sup> When the report was transferred to the Executive Board, the Board voted to accept it and to adopt recommendation four, regarding the appointment of a special committee of nine.<sup>29</sup> Since it was at that same meeting that the Board voted to terminate the campaign for funds for the ill-fated Enlarged Program on November 30, 1920, recommendation five was rendered obsolete, except for the "otherwise" clause whereby funds would have been provided for the support of a board on training.

By the Committee of Nine on National Certification and Training

Williamson agreed to serve as chairman of the Committee of Nine, among whom Josephine A. Rathbone and Phineas L. Windsor were members.<sup>30</sup> A report was prepared calling for the establishment of a National Board of Certification, to which was appended a tentative scheme for gradations of certifications.<sup>31</sup> The contents appeared to be largely the work of Williamson, who wrote to the members of the Committee on May 2, 1921, about six weeks before the report was presented to Council, asking them to examine the draft. He advised the members that the draft represented his interpretation of the views of the members with whom he had conferred.<sup>32</sup>

There were presumably no changes in the draft, for at the Swampscott Conference of 1921 the identical report was offered.<sup>33</sup> It stated as a fundamental principle that it was not only the right but the duty of the American Library Association to formulate standards of fitness. As a corollary, it added that the Association had another right and duty: to create and to contribute to the financial support of a properly constituted body for accrediting training agencies.

After outlining in detail the plan of certification, which allowed for three classes of professional grade and one class of subprofessional or clerical grade, which was included to distinguish conspicuously between professional and clerical work, the Committee took the following position:

In view of the fact that no practicable means of financing the activities of a Certification Board are yet in sight and it is therefore unwise and inexpedient to proceed at once with the organization of the Board, your committee recommends that the Executive Board be empowered to appoint another temporary committee whose duties shall be to give the subject continuous consideration in general and especially (1) to seek financial support, (2) to prepare articles of incorporation and organization of a Certification Board whenever funds are available to carry on its work with a reasonable assurance of permanency.<sup>34</sup>

Following much debate directed toward the tentative scheme of certification rather than toward the proposal for a Board, it was voted "the Committee be continued to give the subject continuous consideration and to report (to the Council) at the midwinter conference." It was voted further that the report be accepted and that the recommendations, as amended by the vote, be approved.<sup>35</sup>

*Reaction to the Swampscott report*

The Committee report had warned of the discord likely to be created by the idea of a national certification system and had cautioned:

We must be on our guard to distinguish between attacks born of selfish and unworthy motives and the sincere questionings of those whose judgment may differ from our own.



An anticipated reaction was forthcoming, the most notable opponent being John Cotton Dana, who lashed out at librarians willing to accept

another "Commission of Interference" which shall examine not only those persons who seek library employment, but most of those already employed; which shall "standardize" all who are "examined," and shall "certificate" such as in their wisdom they find worthy to work in libraries.<sup>36</sup>

In the *Boston Evening Transcript* of October 12, 1921, there appeared an editorial<sup>37</sup> stating that certification was undesirable and condemning certification schemes for making no provision "for the testing of an about-to-be-born-librarian's mettle" but requiring instead the indispensable degree. The *Transcript* concluded with little hope, "It is possible that more of the mediocre will flock to library schools when such attendance is demanded by law, but we are not of the opinion that this will elevate the profession." The Committee was not dismayed, however, and continued its work.

#### *Continuous consideration given to the report*

Continuous consideration was given by the Committee, which reported in due order at the Midwinter meeting. During the latter part of the year, Williamson, while writing the Corporation report, formulated, with the aid of his Committee, resolutions which reflected the optimism of ultimate acceptance of a plan for voluntary certification of librarians.<sup>38</sup> Proposing again the concepts advocated at the Swampscott Conference, the Committee offered the following resolutions:

That the A.L.A.:

1. Approves in principle the plan and purpose of voluntary certification of librarians, as set forth in the report of the special committee on national certification presented to the Council of the A.L.A. at Swampscott, Mass....

2. Empowers and directs the Executive Board of the Association to appoint forthwith a special committee, which committee, in co-operation with representatives of other bodies interested in standards of library service, shall be charged with the following specific duties and be required to report at the next annual conference of the Association, to wit:

- a. To prepare, with the aid of competent legal advice, articles of incorporation for state or federal charter for a national certification board for librarians, in which board the A.L.A. shall always have the power to appoint a majority of the members; and,

- b. To report on ways and means of financing the activities of such a certification board.

Having offered the resolutions in the absence of Williamson, Phineas L. Windsor, a member of the Committee, admitted that he did

not approve any national scheme of certification because he objected to any supervision from outside the state, but that he would recommend the Committee's scheme if one were to be endorsed.<sup>39</sup> Another opponent, Clement W. Andrews, bluntly stated that he was "opposed in principle to the policy of certification." Speaking in support of the plan, Henry N. Sanborn praised it for its drawing a distinction between professional and clerical workers. The divergent views offered evidence that the concept of a national certification program was encountering strong opposition. In the midst of the discussion, a new proposal was introduced by Henry O. Severance, librarian of the University of Missouri, that the establishment of standards be incorporated into state laws. He was readily supported by O. S. Rice, state supervisor of school libraries, of the state of Wisconsin, which had in 1921 adopted a state certification scheme.

With little discussion on the implication of a concept of certification through a state rather than through a national certification board, the Association voted

to recommit the resolution to the existing committee with direction that it formulate standards of certification and provisions which are to be recommended for incorporation into state laws and to suggest methods by which the Association can cooperate in securing the proper legislation.<sup>40</sup>

The acceptance of the motion was a tacit repudiation of the concept of national certification. In such a manner was Williamson's plan for a certification program rejected by the Association. The appropriate time had not arrived for it, in spite of the persuasive sponsorship of the Committee chairman. Following the Midwinter directive for a new approach to the problem of certification, Williamson resigned as chairman of the Committee on National Certification and Training.<sup>41</sup> Within the year 1922, the action taken by the Association on the suggestions outlined by a newly appointed Committee of Nine offered little assurance that any plan for certification would be implemented.

#### By the Second Committee of Nine on National Certification and Training

Following the resignation of Williamson, a new Committee was appointed. Frank K. Walter, former chairman of the defunct Committee of Five on Standardization, Certification, and Library Training, assumed a similar position with the Committee of Nine. The new Committee, only two of whom had served with Williamson, undertook to act in accordance with the Council's directive and offered at the Midwinter meeting of 1922 "Suggestions for a Certificate of Librarians That Can Be Adapted to Conditions in Each State."<sup>42</sup> As compared to Williamson's tentative scheme, which cited as its highest educational prerequisites graduation from an approved college, reading knowledge of one modern language other than English, and a year's successful study in a library school, the Walter standards were a compromise with practicality and existing

conditions. Ignoring Williamson's basic concepts, the Committee suggested that:

To have a first certificate as a professional librarian, the applicant must have at least a high school education, with five years' experience in library work or be a graduate of a regular library school.<sup>43</sup>

Council, instead of favoring a resolution that the Association accept the "Suggestions," rescinded its earlier vote that the Committee formulate and recommend standards for incorporation into state laws. Not willing to abolish the Committee, however, Council voted that it give further consideration to the problem, using "as a basis for establishing grades of library certificates such standards of library service as may be approved by the Association."

By its vacillation rather than by its leadership, Council sustained the concept of standards of certification being authorized by the Association. However, the pattern of delaying for further consideration, the approval and the rescinding of a motion, and, finally, in 1923, the referral of the Committee's report to a newly created committee<sup>44</sup> betokened the ultimate ineffectual contribution of the Committee on National Certification and Training. Had it not been for the efforts of the Committee on Library Training, the Association might have relinquished the concept of a training board altogether, just as it had abandoned finally the concept of certification.

#### By the Committee on Library Training

Having sanctioned in 1920 the creation of a National Board of Library Training or Certification, the Committee on Library Training forthwith offered its co-operation to the Committee on National Certification and Training. It was in his position as chairman of that Committee that Williamson encountered the Committee on Library Training, which secured from him the suggestion that it "might be able to make a material contribution through the formulation of certain standards for library training classes and summer schools."<sup>45</sup> The formulation of such standards became then the assignment for the year, 1920-21.

#### *Subcommittee reports and Committee action, 1921-22*

Through the diligent efforts of a subcommittee, a comprehensive preliminary report was presented in 1921, which attempted to evaluate and to correlate

the courses of instruction offered in training for library service by the various library training classes and summer schools of the country, thereby presenting a uniformity of standards and a basis for staff grading and certification in secondary education in library work.<sup>46</sup>

In 1922, however, the Committee complained that the Association had

been indifferent to its reports even though they included "definite and specific recommendations based on the highest professional experience and thorough study." Having justifiably noted Council's inactivity, Malcolm G. Wyer, chairman, brought to its attention two problems: (1) the need for broadening the opportunities for library training; (2) the need for the correlation of training agencies so that each would have its own field.<sup>47</sup> The resolutions embodying those matters were these:

*Whereas*, The opportunity for securing library training would be broadened if students could progress regularly towards a library school degree by taking extension courses by correspondence and standard library courses in summer schools—with proper safeguards of fixed residence work and personality requirements. Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American Library Association urges upon library school authorities consideration of ways to develop a more uniform system of library training by bringing the various training agencies into a closer co-operation and correlation of work and specifically recommends the following suggestions to secure this end:

1. That the regular library schools offer summer school courses in special subjects for which the same credit be given as for equivalent courses in the regular schools.
2. That some schools offer correspondence courses in certain subjects with credit.
3. That the various library schools adopt a uniform system of credits.<sup>48</sup>

When viewed in awareness that Council had rejected, at its Mid-winter meeting of 1921, the concept of a national certification board, the Committee's resolutions offered an alternative approach—a direct appeal to the library schools by the Association.

Yet Council, after much discussion and disagreement among the library school representatives as to the wisdom of correspondence instruction, hesitated again to make a decision. Instead, it referred the resolutions to the Association of American Library Schools for consideration but with no recommendations, in spite of the opposition of the schools to one of its three specific resolutions. This was the first official communication from Council to the Association, but it can only be accepted as evidence of the continued unwillingness of Council to lend its support to resolutions affecting library training. Though the Committee later reported that the Association had approved the three recommendations,<sup>49</sup> it defined more emphatically its own interpretation of the responsibility of the American Library Association.

*Recommendation for the creation of a board to define standards, etc., 1923*

Undaunted, the Committee returned to Council and again offered a recommendation requiring action. The recommendation was the

outgrowth of the Committee's self-survey and appraisal of its accomplishments and its limitations, notably its lack of authority

to define standards for library schools, to recognize or accredit certain schools, to issue certificates for work completed at approved schools and to assist in establishing a library school.<sup>50</sup>

To counteract its own weakness, the Committee expressed a strong conviction that the time had come, as of 1923, for the Association to "exercise a more positive influence over the various library training agencies of the country."

To enforce its conviction, the Committee proposed that the Association

make effective the policy already approved in regard to library training and provide for the appointment of some board or committee whose function would be to survey and investigate the field of library training agencies for the purpose of defining standards—devising a plan for evaluating or accrediting, organizing all training activities into a general system, suggesting improvements, recommending the establishment of new agencies and promoting education for librarianship in every way.<sup>51</sup>

In offering the recommendation, the Committee chronicled the events of the past: Williamson's 1919 suggestion for the creation of a library training board; Council's decision to accept the recommendations in 1920 of the Committee on Certification and Library Training; and the principle of the 1921 report of the Committee on National Certification and Training, that it was the right and the duty of the Association to formulate standards. Fortified with those statements, all inextricably related to Williamson's 1919 proposal, the Committee was reaffirming, without reference to it, its own approval in 1920 of Williamson's proposal, made at the Asbury Park Conference. As a final incentive to favorable action, the Committee assured Council that "the principle of accrediting professional educational institutions is now so well established that the American Library Association need not shrink from it," since both the American Medical Association and the American Bar Association were pursuing accrediting functions.

#### Creation of a Temporary Library Training Board, April 24, 1923

The recommendation elicited some comments, among them being one from Ernest J. Reece, president of the Association of American Library Schools, and though his reaction was not recorded, there was some indication that he did not approve the recommendation since immediate action was postponed.<sup>52</sup> Council's final response, however, to the documented account of its failure to accept responsibility for the library training programs was to approve, on motion of Malcolm G. Wyer, chairman of the Committee on Library Training, the vote

that a Temporary Library Training Board be appointed by the Executive Board to investigate the field of library training, to formulate tentative standards for all forms of library training agencies, to devise a plan for accrediting such agencies and to report to the Council.<sup>53</sup>

Thus four years after Williamson had advanced his original proposal in his address, "Some Present-Day Aspects of Library Training," a library training board was established, at first temporarily but in the following year on a more enduring basis as the Board of Education for Librarianship.<sup>54</sup> It was that original proposal of Williamson's which the Committee had supported throughout the period, even while the American Library Association evaded the responsibilities inherent in the establishment of such a board.

Four months after the establishment of the Temporary Library Training Board, Williamson's study on *Training for Library Service* appeared. But it was Williamson's contributions, before its publication, which more properly identify the era of library training prior to 1923 as the "Dewey to Williamson" period. Dewey had organized the first School of Library Economy, but it was Williamson who initiated the concept that the Association had a bounden duty to create an agency for accrediting its professional training agencies. Upon the implementation of that concept by the establishment of the Temporary Library Training Board, the pioneer period in the history of training for librarianship had come to an end.

---

## Summary and conclusions

The "Dewey to Williamson" period, as presented in this study, has emerged as an era during which many of the "revolutionary" ideas of 1923 and thereafter were first expressed, debated, and evaluated. Some were experimented with. It was a period of cautious but positive progress in the direction of professionalism. Manifestations of that progress were observable in the program of the New York State Library School, which, by 1902, had raised its admission requirement to a college degree; in the creation by the American Library Association of a Committee on Library Training; in the organization of the Association of American Library Schools.

It was also a period of inquiry concerning the essentials of a program of library training. As of 1903, Mary Wright Plummer had observed that

the first library school—in fact, all the schools—began by laying the chief stress on technique. A perfectly natural beginning, since even the schools themselves had not begun to realize how much must be absorbed besides technique to make a real librarian. As the work of instruction continued, more and more subjects were included in the courses; some were found indispensable and were continued; some were pronounced unnecessary, or tending toward faddishness, and were dropped. Two schools adopted the two-year course as necessary for graduation; one added elective special courses in the second year, and a fourth continued to give only the one year.<sup>1</sup>

In the ensuing twenty years, before the publication of Williamson's report, *Training for Library Service*, there was continuing evidence of experimentation and of a search for standards.

During the period, divisive and conflicting ideas emerged which, while delaying progress, readied the library field for Williamson's report. The conflict flourished because of the suspicion as to the value of and the instructional methods in formal training which was encountered both by graduates of the programs as well as by certain strong-willed individuals who fostered new concepts. Among the latter were: Melvil

Dewey, whose zeal compelled the success of the first School of Library Economy; Aksel G. S. Josephson, who in 1896 proposed a new plan of library education; Mary Wright Plummer, who served as chairman of the Committee on Library Training when the 1906 standards were defined and applied; Azariah Smith Root, under whose chairmanship the hopeful plans of the Committee for a second examination of library schools were sustained; Mary Eileen Ahern, editor of *Public Libraries*, who occupied a strategic position from which to decry or approve developments in the field; Charles C. Williamson, who emerged, by 1919, as an active proponent for a library training or certification board. Within the schools, it was an era in which the tendency existed "from the beginning for library schools to be more or less dominated by a single personality,"<sup>2</sup> notable examples being the directors of the Institute programs.

The conflict flourished also because the American Library Association, with its membership representative of all factions, did not and could not assume a responsibility for unifying the diversified concepts of training inherent in the programs which were being developed. The library schools themselves were only slightly more successful in achieving a unity through the Association of American Library Schools, for the Association acknowledged that it had contributed little, as of 1923, toward the raising of standards.

The American Library Association had expressed an official interest in 1883 when Melvil Dewey had advanced his plans for the proposed establishment of the Columbia College School of Library Economy. Even as of that date, however, opposition was forthcoming, almost prophetically, from William Frederick Poole, and the presentation of a minority report fostered the element of dissent which surrounded those interested in formal training. Throughout the years, the Association, nevertheless, maintained a reportorial communication with the library schools and the training programs, first through its Standing Committee and, later, through its Committee on Library Training.

It was the Committee on Library Training, whose success fluctuated with the quality of its leadership, which fostered the formation of a Section on Professional Training to serve as a forum for membership discussion of the problems of training. The Committee sought to formulate standards of training and had examined, with little impact on future developments, certain library schools before the Carnegie Corporation had authorized its survey of library training. As its final and most notable achievement, the Committee sponsored successfully in 1923 the creation of a Temporary Library Training Board, within the structure of the American Library Association, which was authorized to formulate tentative standards and to devise a plan for accrediting library training agencies.

By its response in creating the Board, the Association, after forty years of vacillation, acknowledged and accepted as its professional responsibility the accrediting of its training agencies. As in the beginning it had been Melvil Dewey who had introduced the concept of formal



training, it was, at the end, Charles C. Williamson who identified an Association responsibility as being the formulation of standards and the accrediting of training agencies which had developed. The Association thus attained, by 1923, a new status, for by pre-empting such authority it was assuming an active role in the future programs of education for librarianship.

Not only, then, as a time of conflict and experimentation but as a precursor of ideas may the "Dewey to Williamson" period be characterized. It was neither dormant nor quiescent, but, prior to this study, little attention had been given to the activities of the period. In marking the end of the epoch, the report on *Training for Library Service* has loomed large, not only because of the prestige of Williamson and the Carnegie Corporation, which undoubtedly enhanced it, but because it came at a time ripe for its recognition by the profession. The major ideas were not original, but for that very reason they had a better chance to make an impact than if they had been completely new. The "Dewey to Williamson" period may seem to have accomplished little within its own time, but, in reality, the post-1923 achievements may be viewed as the culmination of the forces at work in the 1876-1923 era.

#### OTHER STUDIES TO BE MADE

Since this is the first major exploration of the "Dewey to Williamson" period, it is hoped that this study will be an invitation to others to examine the areas either only hinted at or omitted. Special studies are yet to be made on the development of different types of training—for example, the apprentice training programs or the summer schools; on the individual contributions of the library schools; on the development of specialized training programs; on the concept of graduate training; on the contributions of individuals. An imperative need exists for an analysis of the report made by Williamson to the Carnegie Corporation. Only when a thorough review has been made of the events leading to the decision of the Corporation to make an inquiry into the subject of schools for training, the objectives of that study, and the specific recommendations, which have not yet been published, may the contributions of Williamson to library training be measured adequately.

Yet to be evaluated are the activities of the Association of American Library Schools and, to be reassessed, the contents of this study, for Dr. Williamson has warned: "Whatever your conclusions may be, others will come after you, review your findings, and reverse them or modify them."<sup>3</sup> Only, however, when such studies as these have been made, may the "Dewey to Williamson" period be viewed in a more nearly complete perspective.

## Selected bibliography

The references included represent, in large part, the sources consulted in the preparation of this study. Additional titles appear in the footnotes, however, as suggestions for further readings on particular topics.

In the section, "Periodicals," only the volumes of the major titles read are indicated. Individual articles cited in footnotes are not included. The following bibliographies provide, at the present time, the most detailed analyses of these periodicals:

<i>Scope</i>	<i>Author and title</i>
1876-1920	Cannons, Harry George Turner. <i>Bibliography of Library Economy... from 1876 to 1920</i> . Chicago: A.L.A., 1927. Section G, pp. 225-51, "Library Schools and Training for Librarianship"
1921-1932	American Library Association. Junior Members Round Table. <i>Library Literature, 1921-1932: A Supplement to Cannons' Bibliography of Library Economy, 1876-1920</i> . Compiled... under the editorship of Lucile M. Morsch. Chicago: A.L.A., 1934

### *Periodicals*

*ALA Bulletin*. Vols.1-18. Boston: A.L.A., 1907-8; Chicago: A.L.A., 1909-24.

*The Library Journal*. Vols.1-50. New York: F. Leyboldt, 1876-78; New York: Publication Office, 1879-1925. Vol.1 has title: *The American Library Journal*.

*Public Libraries*. Vols.1-28. Chicago: Library Bureau, 1896-1923.  
*Publishers' Weekly*. Vols.1-10. New York: F. Leypoldt, 1872-76.

### Books

- Columbia University. School of Library Service. *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889: Documents for a History*. [New York]: Columbia Univ. School of Library Service, 1937.
- Dawe, Grosvenor. *Melvil Dewey, Seer: Inspirer: Doer, 1851-1931: Biografic Compilation*. "Library Edition." Lake Placid Club, Essex Co., N.Y.: Melvil Dewey Biografy, 1932.
- Fletcher, William I. *Public Libraries in America*. ("Columbian Knowledge Series," No. II.) 2nd ed. Boston: Roberts Bros., 1895.
- Guild, Reuben A. *The Librarian's Manual: A Treatise on Bibliography, Comprising a Select and Descriptive List of Bibliographical Works, to Which Are Added, Sketches of Public Libraries*. New York: Charles B. Norton, 1858.
- Hill, Frank Pierce. *James Bertram: An Appreciation*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1936.
- Jewett, Charles Coffin. *Notices of Public Libraries in the United States of America*. Printed by Order of Congress as an Appendix to the Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Washington, D.C., 1851.
- Johnson, Alvin Saunders. *A Report to Carnegie Corporation on the Policy of Donations to Free Public Libraries*. [Submitted in 1916.] [n.p.: n.d.]
- Reece, Ernest J. *The Curriculum in Library Schools*. ("Columbia University Studies in Library Service," No. 4.) New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1936.
- Rhees, William J. *Manual of Public Libraries, Institutions, and Societies in the United States and British Provinces of North America*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1859.
- Shera, Jesse Hauk. *Foundations of the Public Library: The Origins of the Public Library Movement in New England, 1629-1855*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1949.
- Tai, Tse-Chien. *Professional Education for Librarianship*. New York: Wilson, 1925.
- Trautman, Ray. *A History of the School of Library Service, Columbia University*. ("The Bicentennial History of Columbia University.") New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1954.
- University of Chicago. Graduate Library School. *Education for Librarianship: Papers Presented at the Library Conference, University of Chicago, August 16-21, 1948*. Edited by Bernard Berelson. Chicago: A.L.A., 1949.
- U.S. Bureau of Education. *Public Libraries in the United States of America: Their History, Condition, and Management*. Special Report, Pt. 1. Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1876.
- Williamson, Charles Clarence. *Training for Library Service: A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York*. New York, 1923.

### *Unpublished materials*

- American Library Association. Board of Education for Librarianship. Manuscript collection of materials on the Temporary Library Training Board, 1923-24 (at the Headquarters of the American Library Association).
- Association of American Library Schools. Manuscript collection of materials, 1910-24 (for use of these documents, consult the Secretary of the Association of American Library Schools).
- Reports [Programs, Minutes, Committee Reports, Stenographic Reports, Proceedings], 1915-21 (for use of these documents, consult the Secretary of the Association of American Library Schools). (Mimeographed or typewritten.) Binder's title: Association of A.L.S. Reports.
- Carnegie Corporation of New York. *Memorandum concerning Library Schools, 1918*. [New York, 1918.] Written by James Bertram, secretary, Carnegie Corporation, with the assistance of Charles C. Williamson. "Copy 23; Confidential" (in the files of the Corporation).
- Ford, Gladys. "Contribution of the Commission Type of Summer Library School to Professional Training." Unpublished Master's thesis, Library School, Univ. of Illinois, 1931.
- Neal, Peggy. "Library Problems, 1876-1886: An Analysis of 'Notes and Queries' of *Library Journal* and Proceedings of the American Library Association." Unpublished Master's thesis, Carnegie Library School, Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1954.
- Williamson, Charles Clarence. Manuscript Collection of Materials Relating to the Study Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation, 1920-24. (In the files of Williamson.)
- "Notes on the Aims, Scope and Method of the Study of Training for Library Service, for Discussion at the Meeting of the Advisory Committee, to be Held Wednesday, April 28, 1920." (Typewritten; copy marked "Confidential." In the files of Williamson.)
- Statement Prepared for the Use of Miss Sarah K. Vann, June, 1955. (Typewritten; in the files of Vann.)
- Summary of Report on "Training for Library Work," Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1921. (Typewritten; in the files of Williamson.)
- "Training for Library Work: A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York." Advisory Committee: Herbert Putnam, J. H. Kirkland, [and] Wilson Farrand. New York, 1921. (Type-written; in the files of Williamson.)

### *Other sources*

- Carnegie Corporation of New York. Personal interview with Florence Anderson, secretary, March 5, 1954.
- Personal interview with Charles C. Williamson. Annual Conference of the American Library Association, Philadelphia, 1955.
- Personal interview with Phineas L. Windsor. Midwinter Meeting of the American Library Association, 1957.

---

## Notes

The following abbreviations are used throughout the Notes:

*LJ*: *The Library Journal*. Vols. I-50. New York: F. Leyppoldt, 1876-78; New York: Publication Office, 1879-1925.

Williamson I: Williamson, Charles Clarence. "Training for Library Work: A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York." Advisory Committee: Herbert Putnam, J. H. Kirkland, [and] Wilson Farrand. New York, 1921. (Typewritten; in the files of Williamson.)

Williamson II: Williamson, Charles Clarence. *Training for Library Service*: A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York. New York, 1923.

### Introduction

1. Williamson II.
2. Louis Round Wilson, "Historical Development of Education for Librarianship in the United States," in Bernard Berelson, ed., *Education for Librarianship: Papers Presented at the Library Conference, University of Chicago, August 16-21, 1948* (Chicago: A.L.A., 1949), pp.44-48.
3. Robert D. Leigh, "The Education of Librarians," in Alice I. Bryan, *The Public Librarian: A Report of the Public Library Inquiry of the Social Science Research Council* (New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1952), pp.302-6.
4. Frank K. Walter, "A Dynamic Report," a review of *Training for Library Service*, by Charles C. Williamson, *LJ*, 48:709 (September 1, 1923).
5. "The Williamson Report: Comment from Librarians: Chicago Public Library," *LJ*, 48:1001 (December 1, 1923).
6. "The Williamson Report: Comment from the Library Schools," *LJ*, 48:903 (November 1, 1923).
7. Williamson II, pp.[136]-46.
8. Williamson I.

### Chapter I

#### *Before formal training: methods of securing training*

1. *Publishers' Weekly*, 5:136-37 (February 7, 1874).
2. Melvil Dewey, "Apprenticeship of Librarians," *LJ*, 4:[147]-48 (May, 1879).

3. Lloyd P. Smith, "The Qualifications of a Librarian," *LJ*, 1:69-74 (November 30, 1876).
4. John Burt Wight, circular letter, pp.2-3, quoted in Jesse H. Shera, *Foundations of the Public Library: The Origins of the Public Library Movement in New England, 1629-1855* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1949), p.199.
5. U.S. Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States of America: Their History, Condition, and Management*; Special Report, Pt. 1 (Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1876), pp.1012-1142, cited hereafter as Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States*, 1876.
6. *Ibid.*, p.xvi.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*, p.773. The data for 1849 were extracted from Charles C. Jewett, *Notices of Public Libraries in the United States of America*: Printed by Order of Congress, as an Appendix to the Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C., 1851).
9. *LJ*, 26:317-23 (June, 1901).
10. ["Development of Library Training"—editorial comment], *ibid.*, p.315.
11. Mary Wright Plummer, "Training for Librarianship," *ibid.*, p.317.
12. Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States*, 1876, p.xxviii.
13. Justin Winsor, "A Word to Starters of Libraries," *LJ*, 1:1 (September, 1876).
14. *Ibid.*, pp.2-3. Winsor did not enumerate the seven suggestions in the same fashion as has been done for the present paper. All the points are included as direct quotations except suggestion 5, which summarizes the thought pertaining to diversity of opinions among librarians.
15. R. L. Davis, "Some Library Reminiscences," *Public Libraries*, 22:180 (May, 1917).
16. *Ibid.*
17. James L. Whitney, "Reminiscences of an Old Librarian," *LJ*, 34:474 (November, 1909).
18. "As It Was in the Beginning [William Isaac Fletcher]," *Public Libraries*, 29:522 (November, 1924). For a more detailed sketch of Fletcher as a librarian and his preparation for that career, see Donald B. Engley, "The Emergence of the Amherst College Library, 1821-1911" (unpublished Master's thesis, Graduate Library School, Univ. of Chicago, 1947), pp.111-26.
19. William I. Fletcher, "Biographical Sketches of Librarians and Bibliographers, II, William Frederick Poole, 1821-94," *Bulletin of Bibliography and Dramatic Index*, 8:31 (April, 1914).
20. "The Change at Boston," *LJ*, 1:401-2 (July, 1877); ["The Boston Blow to Public Libraries"—editorial comment], *ibid.*, p.395.
21. ["The St. Louis Library Removal"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 1:221 (February 28, 1877).
22. *Ibid.*
23. "Notes" [Politics in Library Management], *The Nation*, 35:486-87 (December 7, 1882).
24. ["The St. Louis Difficulty"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 5:106 (April, 1880); ["Political Use of the Library"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 9:[3]-4 (January, 1884); ["Politics in State Libraries"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 24:[51] (February, 1899).
25. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1883," *LJ*, 8:291 (September-October, 1883).

Note: Throughout the footnotes a uniform entry has been adopted for recording the proceedings of the annual meetings of the American Library Association. The entry is: American Library Association, "Proceedings, [year]."

26. ["Political Use of the Library"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 9:[3]-4 (January, 1884).
27. Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States*, 1876, p.733.
28. "How To Become a Librarian," *LJ*, 10:106 (May, 1885).
29. Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States*, 1876, p.xii.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*, pp.476-504.
32. *Ibid.*, pp.431-33, 465-75.
33. Justin Winsor, "A Word to Starters of Libraries," *LJ*, 1:2 (September, 1876).
34. Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States*, 1876, pp.xxiii-xxvi.
35. *Ibid.*
36. U.S. Superintendent of Documents, *Checklist of United States Public Documents, 1789-1909* (3rd ed., rev. and enl.; Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1911), pp.460-67.
37. *Norton's Literary Gazette*, 3:82 (May 15, 1853).
38. "Proceedings of the Librarians' Convention, held in New York City, September 15, 16, and 17, 1853," are reproduced in George Burwell Utley, *The Librarians' Conference of 1853* (Chicago: A.L.A., 1951), pp.131-76. The Proceedings were "printed by photo-offset from *Norton's Literary and Educational Register*, for 1854."
39. *Ibid.*, p.145.
40. ["Publicity"], *American Journal of Education*, 5:[5] (June, 1858).
41. T. H. Vail (ed.), "Hints on Reading," *American Journal of Education*, 2:[215]-30 (August, 1856).
42. "Importance of Reading to the Business Man, the Mechanic, and the Manufacturer," *ibid.*, pp.216-19.
43. The first issue had the following title: "*The Publishers' and Stationers' Weekly Trade Circular: A Journal Devoted to the Interests of the Publishing, Printing, Book, Stationery, News, Music, Art and Fancy Trades, and Associated Branches. With which is incorporated the American Literary Gazette and Publishers' Circular.*" The use of the name *Publishers' Weekly* dates from 1873.
44. *Publishers' Weekly*, 5:137 (February 7, 1874).
45. Information about Fentress is meager. Although his name appears, on p.1143 of the Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States*, as librarian of the San José Library Association, he did not attend the meeting of librarians in Philadelphia nor did any reference to that meeting appear in the *San José Mercury-News*. He made no contributions to the *Library Journal*.  
The San José Public Library had no records of the Library Association, formed on June 11, 1872, which on February 25, 1879, was turned over to the city (letter from Mrs. Alice L. Olsen, Reference Librarian, San José Public Library, March 28, 1956).
46. *Publishers' Weekly*, 5:34 (January 10, 1874). This, as far as can be ascertained, is the first reference to Dewey in *Publishers' Weekly*.
47. *Ibid.*, 9:632 (May 20, 1876).
48. *Ibid.*, 10:601-2 (October 7, 1876).
49. "The American Library Journal, Prospectus," quoted in Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States*, 1876, p.xxviii.
50. Conference of Librarians, London, 1877, "Proceedings," *LJ*, 2:280-81 (January-February, 1878).
51. John Winter Jones, "Inaugural Address," *LJ*, 2:117 (November-December, 1877).
52. A. M. Pendleton, "How To Start Libraries in Small Towns," *LJ*, 1:[161]-62

- (January, 1877); 1:213-16 (February, 1877); 1:249-59 (March, 1877); 1:313-14 (May, 1877); 1:355-59 (June, 1877); 1:421-22 (August, 1877). The serializing of an article, definitely written for the novice, might have been a technique employed to increase the sales of the *Journal*; it could only have deterred a self-training program.
53. Justin Winsor, "Reference Books in English," *LJ*, 1:247 (March, 1877).
  54. ["The American Library Journal"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 1:12 (September, 1876). Throughout the years other features were added: for example, in 1881 appeared the section, "A Selection of New Books, with Notes of Commendation or Caution."
  55. *Ibid.*, p.13.
  56. Peggy Neal, "Library Problems, 1876-1886: An Analysis of 'Notes and Queries' of *Library Journal* and Proceedings of the American Library Association" (unpublished Master's thesis, Carnegie Library School, Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1954), pp.14, 19, 109, 111. See pp.19-30 for a detailed analysis in which the contents of "Notes and Queries" have been analyzed according to fourteen major categories and forty-four subdivisions.
  57. "Notes and Queries," *LJ*, 4:25 (January, 1879).
  58. *Ibid.*, 5:55 (February, 1880).
  59. Melvil Dewey, "Apprenticeship of Librarians," *LJ*, 4:[147] (May, 1879).
  60. John Fiske, "A Librarian's Work," *Atlantic Monthly*, 38:480-91 (October, 1876). The refutation is included in John Fiske, *Darwinism and Other Essays* ("Standard Library Edition: The Miscellaneous Writings of John Fiske"; New York: Houghton, 1907), pp.313-[49].
  61. "How To Become a Librarian," *LJ*, 10:106 (May, 1885).
  62. "The Mission of the *Library Notes*," *Library Notes*, 1:8 (June, 1886).
  63. "Preparation for the Library School," *Library Notes*, 1:271 (March, 1887).
  64. ["The Plan of the *American Library Journal*"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 1:14 (September, 1876).
  65. Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States*, 1876, p.733. Spofford was referring to Edward Edwards, *Memoirs of Libraries: Including a Handbook of Library Economy* (London: Trübner, 1859).
  66. *Ibid.*, pp.623-48.
  67. Conference of Librarians, 1876, "Proceedings," *LJ*, 1:140 (November, 1876).
  68. "American Library Association, Constitution," *LJ*, 1:253 (February, 1877).
  69. Peggy Neal, *op. cit.*, pp.31-34, 99-108.
  70. A summary of the activities of the Committee is to be found in the 1893 report, presented by William H. Brett at the Chicago Conference (American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1893," *LJ*, 18:68-71 [September, 1893]).
  71. Justin Winsor, "The President's Address," *LJ*, 2:[5] (September, 1877).
  72. *Ibid.*, p.6.
  73. ["The Boston Conference"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 4:195 (June, 1879).
  74. American Library Association, "Fourth General Meeting—Programme," *LJ*, 6:4 (January, 1881); "The Washington Conference," *LJ*, 6:24 (February, 1881).
  75. Samuel S. Green, "Library Aids," *LJ*, 6:111 (April, 1881).
  76. James Lyman Whitney, "Selecting and Training Library Assistants," *LJ*, 7:137 (July-August, 1882).
  77. *Ibid.*, p.138.
  78. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1882," *ibid.*, p.200.



## Chapter II

*Toward a formal training program: Dewey and the  
Columbia College School of Library Economy*

1. Bureau of Education, *Public Libraries in the United States*, 1876, pp.623-48.
2. Melvil Dewey, "The Profession," *LJ*, 1:5 (September, 1876).
3. Melvil Dui (*sic*), "Consulting Librarianship," *LJ*, 5:16 (January, 1880); American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1882," *LJ*, 7:197 (July-August, 1882).
4. Conference of Librarians, London, 1877, "List of [216] Members of Conference," *LJ*, 2:285-89 (January-February, 1878).
5. Conference of Librarians, London, 1877, "Proceedings," *ibid.*, p.280. Although the "Proceedings" make no further reference to the Italian plan, at the May, 1879, meeting of the Library Association of the United Kingdom, Count Ugo Balzani, Keeper of the Mss. in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele, Rome, outlined the proposed course of study. The following seven subjects were to be included: "(1) The history and external conditions of books both in early and in later times. (2) Some elementary knowledge of how to define and classify the sciences, and information with regard to the principal and most fundamental works belonging to each. (3) Similar knowledge of the origin and varieties of hand-writing, of the invention and history of printing, and of the state of the book trade. (4) On the general idea and arrangement of a library, the administration of its internal machinery, and of its relations with the public. (5) On the formation of catalogues, and information with regard to the most important works on bibliography. (6) Some knowledge of the working machinery, endowments and actual condition of the principal libraries of Europe, and their history. (7) The elements of paleography" (Count Ugo Balzani, "On the Regulations of Italian Public Libraries," *LJ*, 4:[183]-87 [June, 1879]).
6. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1883," *LJ*, 8:293 (September-October, 1883).
7. Melvil Dewey, "Apprenticeship of Librarians," *LJ*, 4:[147] (May, 1879). Dewey carefully informed the readers of the *Library Journal* that his paper had been "written before, and independently of," the paper by Count Balzani when the latter was published in the June, 1879, issue of the *Journal*; see Note 5 above ([*"The Boston Conference"*—editorial comment], *LJ*, 4:195 [June, 1879]).
8. James Lyman Whitney, "Selecting and Training Library Assistants," *LJ*, 7:137 (July-August, 1882).
9. Ray Trautman, *A History of the School of Library Service, Columbia University* ("The Bicentennial History of Columbia University"; New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1954), p.6.
10. Grosvenor Dawe, *Melvil Dewey, Seer: Inspirer: Doer, 1851-1931: Biographic Compilation* ("Library Edition"; Lake Placid Club, Essex Co., N.Y.: Melvil Dewey Biografy, 1932), p.328.
11. Columbia College, School of Library Economy, "Circular of Information, 1884," p.23, quoted in Columbia University, School of Library Service, *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889: Documents for a History* ([New York]: Columbia Univ. School of Library Service, 1937), p.39, cited hereafter as "Circular of Information, 1884"; pagination to refer to that of the volume in which the Circular and other documents are included, the latter to be cited as *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889*.

The text of the proposal is reprinted in full in "Circular of Information,

1884," pp.37-39. It is reprinted in part in American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1883," *LJ*, 8:285-87 (September-October, 1883).

12. "Circular of Information, 1884," pp.38-39.

13. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1883," *LJ*, 8:285-88 (September-October, 1883).

14. *Ibid.*, p.288.

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Ibid.*, pp.289-90.

17. Many years later, at the Portland Conference of 1905, Crunden overemphasized his part in the drama of 1883 but, on the whole, his recollections gave a fair picture of the memorable discussion relating to the proposed library school. He recalled:

"In the convention of 1883 at Buffalo, when Mr. Dewey proposed his library school plan, I believe I was the only librarian who spoke out confidently and positively as to the value of such a school. I remember distinctly the scoffing manner in which the proposition was treated by some of the older librarians, two most distinguished librarians in particular" (American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1905," *LJ*, 30:169 [September, 1905]).

According to the records of 1883, however, Crunden spoke only once and then long after others had supported the plan. His contribution was:

"In saying that this school is desirable, we are not called upon for anything further, as to qualifications for entrance, etc. This friction that we have had will produce a healthy reaction from the cold water" (American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1883," *LJ*, 8:290 [September-October, 1883]).

18. *Ibid.*

19. *Ibid.*, p.293.

20. *Ibid.*, p.294.

21. *Ibid.*, p.290.

22. *Ibid.*, p.294.

23. "The Library and School of Library Economy: An Extract from the Annual Report of F. A. P. Barnard, President of Columbia College, made to the Trustees, May 5, 1884," p.37, quoted in *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889*, p.13.

24. "Circular of Information, 1884," p.39.

25. *Ibid.*, pp.40-41.

26. American Library Association, "Report of the Committee on the Proposed School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 10:293, footnote (September-October, 1885).

27. Columbia College, Library, "Excerpts from 'Second and Third Annual Reports' of the Columbia College Library, June 30, 1886," quoted in *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889*, p.58.

28. "Circular of Information, 1884," p.38.

29. American Library Association, "Meeting of Executive Board," *LJ*, 10:4 (January, 1885). Dewey announced the transfer of the collection to Columbia College in the first issue of *Library Notes* in "Bibliothecal Museum," *Library Notes*, 1:53 (June, 1886).

30. Dewey stated in the "Circular of Information, 1886-87," p.85, that "the general plan was announced in the two preceding annual circulars."

Only two circulars are reproduced in *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889*: "Circular of Information, 1884," pp.17-51; "Circular of Information, 1886-87," pp.61-105.

31. "Circular of Information, 1884," p.33.

32. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1883," *LJ*, 8:285 (September-October, 1883).

33. "Circular of Information, 1884," p.43.
34. *Ibid.*
35. For information on the "case method," consult, for example, Kenneth Richmond Andrews, *The Case Method of Teaching Human Relations and Administration* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1951); Malcolm Perrine McNair, *The Case Method at the Harvard Business School* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954); Diana Henryetta Sperle, *The Case Method Technique in Professional Training* ("Contributions to Education," No. 571; New York: Teachers College, Columbia Univ. 1933).
- For information on the "case method" in library administration, consult Kenneth R. Shaffer, *Twenty-Five Short Cases in Library Personnel Administration* (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, 1959).
36. "Circular of Information, 1886-87," pp.93-99. Dewey identified book houses as "representative houses, where can be learned to the best advantage so much as a librarian needs to know about publishing, printing, binding, illustrating, book-selling, book-auctions, second-hand book-stores, and the many things allied to the work of the librarian" (*ibid.*, p.95).
37. "Circular of Information, 1884," p.49.
38. "Circular of Information, 1886-87," pp.99-102.
39. Robert D. Leigh, "Evolution of Library Schools," in Alice I. Bryan, *The Public Librarian: A Report of the Public Library Inquiry of the Social Science Research Council* (New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1952), p.304.
40. "Circular of Information, 1886-87," p.87.
41. *Ibid.*, pp.96-97.
42. *Ibid.*, p.87.
43. Melvil Dewey, "Apprenticeship of Librarians," *LJ*, 4:[147] (May, 1879).
44. Melvil Dewey, "The Librarian's Qualifications, Hours, and Salary," *Library Notes*, 1:91 (October, 1886).
45. "Circular of Information, 1886-87," p.88.
46. *Ibid.*, pp.104-5. In 1923, thirty-seven years later, Williamson recommended a similar preparation for the profession, which, though differing in length of course and in content, was essentially Dewey's pattern of training. Williamson stated in his "Findings and Recommendations," that: "Between the year of general study and the period of special training at least one year of first-class library experience should be required" (Williamson II, p.143).
47. *Library Notes* (June, 1886), cover title.
48. *Ibid.*, 1:112-31 (October, 1886).
49. "The Library Quartet and Its Work," *Library Notes*, 1:6 (June, 1886).
50. *Library Notes*, 1:85 (October, 1886).
51. Melvil Dewey, "The Librarian's Qualifications, Hours, and Salary," *ibid.*, p.91.
52. Ray Trautman, *op. cit.*, p.9.
53. Conference of Librarians, London, 1877, "Proceedings," *LJ*, 2:280 (January-February, 1878).
54. "School of Library Economy Extra Lectures," *Library Notes*, 1:108-10 (October, 1886).
55. *Library Notes*, 1:201-2 (December, 1886).
56. *Ibid.*, 2:195-211 (December, 1887); 2:271-85 (March, 1888).
57. "Circular of Information, 1886-87," p.86.
58. American Library Association, "Report of the Committee on the Proposed School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 10:294 (September-October, 1885). Their names are affixed to the report with the indication that W. E. Foster served as "Reporter." The offices and positions held by the committee members are to be found in the list of "Officers of the American Library Association," *ibid.*, pp.347-48.

59. *Ibid.*, p.291.
60. *Ibid.*, p.292.
61. *Ibid.*, p.293.
62. *Ibid.*, p.294.
63. American Library Association, "Report of the Committee on the Proposed School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 10:293, footnote (September-October, 1885).
64. *Library Notes*, 1:50-51 (June, 1886).
65. Williamson II, pp.3-11.
66. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1886," *LJ*, 11:376 (August-September, 1886). The report of the Committee on the School of Library Economy was read at the fifth session of the Conference.
67. *Ibid.*
68. "Circular of Information, 1886-87," p.86.

### *Chapter III*

*After the introduction of formal training, 1887-89:  
from Columbia to Albany*

1. "School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 12:78 (January-February, 1887). Not included in the total number were members of the Columbia College Library staff who took the course without payment of fees.
2. Some of the turmoil created and the internal administrative problems encountered by Dewey because of the admission of women will be found in the studies by Ray Trautman and Grosvenor Dawe (see Selected Bibliography, p.194).
3. "School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 12:78-80 (January-February, 1887). The names of all the lecturers and their subjects are included.
4. "Library School Register for 1887-88," *Library Notes*, 2:236 (December, 1887).
5. "School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 12:78 (January-February, 1887). In addition to the three men, whose names appeared in the *Library Journal*, Salome Cutler is listed as having been an instructor in the Columbia Library School, 1887-89. New York State Library, *Register of New York State Library School*, January 5, 1887-December 31, 1911 ("Education Department Bulletin," No. 521; "Library School," No. 31; Albany, N.Y.: Univ. of the State of New York, 1912), p.8, cited hereafter as New York State Library, *Register of New York State Library School*.
6. Mary Wright Plummer, "The Columbia College School of Library Economy from a Student's Standpoint," *LJ*, 12:363 (September-October, 1887).
7. "School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 12:168 (April, 1887). The course in library linguistics emphasized those language skills which the cataloger needed in handling books in various languages: for example, the study of nominative and genitive forms of an author's name and title-page vocabulary in languages such as German, French, Italian, Spanish, and Latin.
8. *Ibid.*, p.169.
9. ["The School of Library Economy"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 12:4 (January-February, 1887).
10. *LJ*, 12:121-23, 145 (March, 1887).
11. ["Cataloguing for Small Libraries"—editorial comment], *ibid.*, p.[115].
12. *LJ*, 12:511 (November, 1887).
13. "Colleges of Liberal Arts" [extracts from annual reports including that of Columbia College], U.S. Bureau of Education, *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year, 1887-88* (Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1889), p.666.

14. American Library Association, "Report of the Committee on the School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 12:427 (September-October, 1887).
15. *Ibid.*, p.428.
16. Mary Wright Plummer, "The Columbia College School of Library Economy from a Student's Standpoint," *ibid.*, p.364.
17. *Ibid.*, p.363.
18. Mary Wright Plummer, "Pages from the Note Books of Mary Wright Plummer on the Lectures for March, 1887," *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889*, pp.136-59.
19. May Seymour, "Pages from the Note Books of May Seymour on the Lectures for March, 1887," *ibid.*, pp.160-83.
20. Mary Wright Plummer, "The Columbia College School of Library Economy from a Student's Standpoint," *LJ*, 12:363-64 (September-October, 1887).
21. *Ibid.*, p.364.
22. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1887," *ibid.*, p.449.
23. "Reports of the Committee on the School of Library Economy," *Library Notes*, 2:230-34 (December, 1887).
24. "Directors' Note on the Reports," *ibid.*, p.234.
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*, p.235.
27. "School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 12:167 (April, 1887).
28. *Ibid.*, pp.167-68.
29. Columbia College, "Extract from the Annual Report of President F. A. P. Barnard to the Trustees of Columbia College, May 2, 1887," quoted in *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889*, pp.217-18.
30. "Library School Register for 1887-88," *Library Notes*, 2:237 (December, 1887).
31. *Ibid.*, pp.237-38.
32. "Preparation for the Library School," *Library Notes*, 1:272 (March, 1887).
33. *Ibid.*, p.271. Not only did Dewey suggest learning the library handwriting; he included in the same issue of *Library Notes* a detailed explanation of how to learn that style of writing. See "Library Handwriting," *ibid.*, pp.273-82.
34. "Preparation for the Library School," *ibid.*, p.271. He stated, "The first thing needed is a set of *Library Notes*."
35. *Ibid.*, p.272.
36. "Columbia Library School," *LJ*, 13:97 (March-April, 1888).
37. "Changes in the Library School for the Second Year," *Library Notes*, 1:268 (March, 1887).
38. Columbia College, School of Library Economy, "Annual Register, 1887-88," p.5, quoted in *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889*, p.223.
39. ["Library School"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 13:276 (September-October, 1888).
40. "Columbia Library School," *LJ*, 13:97 (March-April, 1888).
41. "Library Instruction: Summary of Plans Proposed To Aid in Educating Librarians," *Library Notes*, 2:286-98 (March, 1888).
42. "Special Students and Partial Course," *ibid.*, p.296.
43. "Correspondence Library School," *ibid.*, p.290.
44. *Ibid.*, p.291.
45. Columbia College, Library ["Extract from Columbia College Library Annual Report"], *LJ*, 13:349 (November, 1888).
46. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1888," *LJ*, 13:319 (September-October, 1888).
47. Williamson II, p.[114].
48. "Summer School for Librarians," *Library Notes*, 2:292-96 (March, 1888).

49. *Ibid.*, p.294.
50. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1888," *LJ*, (September-October, 1888).
51. "Library Instruction: Summary of Plans Proposed To Aid in Educating Librarians," *Library Notes*, 2:287 (March, 1888).
52. Williamson II, pp.101-2.
53. Grosvenor Dawe, *Melvil Dewey, Seer: Inspirer: Doer, 1851-1931: Biographic Compilation* ("Library Edition"; Lake Placid Club, Essex Co., N.Y.: Melvil Dewey Biography, 1932), p.184.
54. "Minutes of the Trustees, December 3, 1888," quoted in Ray Trautman, *A History of the School of Library Service, Columbia University* (New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1954), p.20.
55. New York State Library, "A New State Librarian," *LJ*, 14:46 (January-February, 1889); Grosvenor Dawe, *loc. cit.*
56. "Library School; Removal to Albany," *LJ*, 14:133 (April, 1889).
57. "Minutes of the Trustees, February 4, 1889," quoted in Ray Trautman, *op. cit.*, p.21.
58. ["Library School"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 14:4 (January-February, 1889).
59. "The New State Librarian," quoted *ibid.*, p.46.
60. "Minutes of the Regents, July 10, 1889," quoted in New York State Library School, *The First Quarter Century [of the] New York State Library School, 1887-1912* (New York: Education Department, New York State Library School, 1912), p.19.
61. *Ibid.*, pp.22-23.
62. *Ibid.*, p.19.
63. The minutes of the Board of Trustees of Columbia College of February 4, 1889, imply that Dewey had employed means less than straightforward as he manipulated for the transfer. The minutes state:  
 "It is obvious that this resolution [of the Board of Regents of the University] must have been adopted by the Regents of the University under an erroneous impression of the facts, and derived from the representations of the College, as the proposal to transfer the school to Albany did not come from your Committee or from the Acting President but from the late librarian of the College, and the part of the Committee consisted simply in consenting to Mr. Dewey's suggestion. So great, however, was the anxiety of your Committee to have this matter ended and to close the School of Library Economy with the least possible delay, that they considered it best to overlook the error of the Regents for the present, and to facilitate the plan submitted to them and substantially approved by the Regents" (Minutes of the Trustees, February 4, 1889, quoted in Ray Trautman, *op. cit.*, p.21).

#### Chapter IV

##### *The New York State Library School to 1893*

1. "Columbia Library School," *LJ*, 14:6 (January-February, 1889).
2. "Library School: Removal to Albany," *LJ*, 14:134 (April, 1889).
3. *Ibid.*
4. "New York Library School: First Entrance Examinations for the Library School in Connection with the State Library," *LJ*, 14:446 (November, 1889).
5. *Ibid.*, pp.446-47.
6. "Library School: The Fall Term Programme," *LJ*, 14:479 (December, 1889).
7. Williamson II, p.27.
8. "Circular of Information, 1886-87," pp.89-90.
9. "Changes in the Library School for the Second Year," *Library Notes*, 1:268 (March, 1887).

10. Letter from Class of 1887-88, quoted in *School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889*, p.269; Letter from the Classes of 1888 and 1889, quoted *ibid.*, p.270; [Certificate from Seth Low, president of Columbia College, to Nina E. Browne, dated March 20, 1891], quoted *ibid.*, p. 271.
11. New York State Library School, *The First Quarter Century [of the] New York State Library School, 1887-1912* (New York: Education Department, New York State Library School, 1912), p.25. This volume should be consulted for a detailed history of the School.
12. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1889," *LJ*, 14:269 (May-June, 1889).
13. *Ibid.*, p.278.
14. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1891," *LJ*, 16:87 (December, 1891).
15. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1890," *LJ*, 15:95 (December, 1890).
16. *Ibid.*, p.91.
17. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1891," *LJ*, 16:85 (December, 1891).
18. *Ibid.*, p.87.
19. See p.46.
20. Richardson stated: "The aim of the school is to teach library economy. It makes little pretension to covering the field of library science. This is to be regretted, and it is hoped that the broadening, already carried to a considerable and gratifying extent, will be extended to cover all the branches in which an ambitious librarian needs to be grounded." Richardson included, in his definition of library science, the study of bibliography and of the handling of manuscripts, the former of which was being offered but not to the extent considered appropriate by Richardson (American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1890," *LJ*, 15:93 [December, 1890]).
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Ibid.*, p.94.
23. Williamson II, p.143.
24. Andrew Carnegie, "The Best Fields for Philanthropy," *The North American Review*, 169:688-90 (December, 1889).
25. Letter from Melvil Dewey, May 12, 1890, quoted in Grosvenor Dawe, *Melvil Dewey, Seer: Inspirer: Doer, 1851-1931: Biographic Compilation* ("Library Edition"; Lake Placid Club, Essex Co., N.Y.: Melvil Dewey Biography, 1932), p.201.
26. Letter from Andrew Carnegie, May 15, 1890, quoted *ibid.*, p.200.
27. Letter from Melvil Dewey, May 21, 1890, quoted *ibid.*, p.335.
28. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1891," *LJ*, 16:86 (December, 1891).
29. Harriet E. Green, "Library Experts--Their Rights and Duties," *LJ*, 15:15-19 (December, 1890).
30. Mary Wright Plummer, "The Value of a School for Library Training," *LJ*, 16:40-44 (February, 1891).
31. *Ibid.*, p.41. The four questions addressed to employing librarians and trustees are to be found on p.41; five of the questions addressed to the graduates are to be found on p.43.
32. *Ibid.*, p.43.
33. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1892," *LJ*, 17:31-34 (August, 1892). Each of the three Committee members presented an individual report.
34. *Ibid.*, p.33.

35. "As It Was in the Beginning [Justin Winsor]," *Public Libraries*, 29:15 (January, 1924).
36. ["The Comparative Exhibit"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 18:[277] (August, 1893).
37. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1893," *LJ*, 18:75 (September, 1893).

### Chapter V

#### *Emergence of new training programs in the nineteenth century*

1. ["Library Progress in 1899—Carnegie Year"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 25:[3] (January, 1900). Specific donations are recorded in the various issues of the *Library Journal* throughout the 1890's.
2. U.S. Bureau of Education, *Statistics of Public, Society, and School Libraries Having 5,000 Volumes and Over in 1908* ("United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1909," No. 5; Whole No. 405; Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1909), pp.5-6.
3. American Library Association, "Report of the Committee on Library Schools, 1889-1900," *LJ*, 25:83 (August, 1900).
4. "Iowa Library Society," *LJ*, 20:176 (May, 1895); "Iowa Library Association," *LJ*, 21:109 (March, 1896).
5. "Summer Courses in Library Science, Lincoln, Nebraska," *LJ*, 20:208 (June, 1895); Katharine L. Sharp, "Wisconsin Summer School of Library Science," *LJ*, 21:193 (April, 1896).
6. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1891," *LJ*, 16:87 (December, 1891).
7. Josephine Adams Rathbone, "The Pratt Institute School of Library Science," *LJ*, 46:[935] (November 15, 1921).
8. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1891," *LJ*, 16:87 (December, 1891).
9. "The Pratt Institute: Free Public Library and Library School," *LJ*, 17:239-40 (July, 1892).
10. "Pratt Institute Library School," *LJ*, 21:330 (July, 1896).
11. "School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 12:79 (January-February, 1887); "Library School," *LJ*, 14:134 (April, 1889).
12. *Library Notes*, 1:292-96 (March, 1888).
13. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1891," *LJ*, 16:88 (December, 1891).
14. "Amherst Summer School," *LJ*, 16:113 (April, 1891).
15. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1891," *LJ*, 16:88 (December, 1891).
16. "Amherst Summer School of Library Economy," *LJ*, 30:487 (August, 1905). For additional information on the Amherst Summer School see Donald B. Engley, "The Emergence of the Amherst College Library, 1821-1911" (unpublished Master's thesis, Graduate Library School, Univ. of Chicago, 1947), pp.120-21. Engley commented:  
 "Unfortunately, little else is known about the library school although it appears to have run successfully for a number of years through 1905. Fletcher's annual reports as librarian are singularly unrevealing concerning school matters, no doubt due to the fact that the summer school was not administered by the college but was a private venture using the college facilities."
17. Marion Horton, "The Los Angeles Library School," *LJ*, 48:[959] (November, 15, 1923).
18. "The Los Angeles Public Library Training Class," *LJ*, 17:234-36 (July, 1892).



19. Tessa L. Kelso, "The Los Angeles Public Library Training Class," American Library Association, *Papers Prepared for the [World's Library Congress] Held at the Columbian Exposition, 1893*; edited by Melvil Dewey ("U.S. Bureau of Education, Whole No. 224," Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1896), pp.764-71.
20. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1894," *LJ*, 19:118 (December, 1894).
21. "Librarians... Kelso, Miss Tessa L.," *LJ*, 20:186 (May, 1895).
22. Los Angeles Public Library, "Report for the Year Ending November 30, 1900" [extract], *LJ*, 16:160 (March, 1901).
23. Williamson II, p.151.
24. Katharine L. Sharp, "The Department of Library Science of Armour Institute, Chicago," *LJ*, 19:164 (May, 1894).
25. Williamson II, p.142.
26. "The Drexel Library Class," *LJ*, 17:488 (December, 1892).
27. "The Drexel Institute Library Class," *LJ*, 18:292 (August, 1893).
28. "P. D. Armour's Gift to Chicago," *LJ*, 18:13 (January, 1893).
29. Katharine L. Sharp, "The Department of Library Science of Armour Institute, Chicago," *LJ*, 19:163-64 (May, 1894).
30. W. B. Wickersham, "A Brief Sketch of Some of the Libraries in Chicago," *LJ*, 20:276 (August, 1895).
31. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1895," *LJ*, 20:62 (December, 1895).
32. Katharine L. Sharp, "University of Illinois State Library School," *LJ*, 23:63 (August, 1898); "University of Illinois State Library School," *LJ*, 22:268 (May, 1897).
33. American Library Association, "Report of Committee on Library Schools, 1896-1897," *LJ*, 22:89 (October, 1897).
34. *Ibid.*, p.90.
35. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1896," *LJ*, 21:93-96 (December, 1896).
36. Williamson II, pp.149-51.
37. *Ibid.*, p.84.
38. *Annual Report of the Maine State College for the Year, 1894* (Augusta: Burleigh and Flint, 1895), p.91.  
 Louis T. Ibbotson, librarian, University of Maine, wrote in 1954: "Although I have no evidence to support it, I would suggest that Miss Fernald (later Mrs. John A. Pierce) conducted the course in much the same fashion as Melvil Dewey did in the first years of the New York Library School. Miss Fernald was graduated with the first class and undoubtedly carried on with missionary zeal in the wilds of Maine" (letter from Louis T. Ibbotson, librarian, University of Maine, Orono, Maine, April 8, 1954).
39. *Catalogue of the Maine State College, 1894-1895* (Augusta: Burleigh and Flint, 1895), p.48.
40. "The Library Course of Maine State College," *LJ*, 19:268 (August, 1894).
41. *Annual Report of the Maine State College for the Year, 1896* (Augusta: Kennebec Journal Print, 1897), p.23. For Miss Fernald's request that she be relieved from the work of instruction, see p.77.
42. William I. Fletcher, *Public Libraries in America* ("Columbian Knowledge Series," No. II, 2nd ed.; Boston: Roberts Bros., 1895), p.154.
43. W. P. Cutter, "Columbian University," *LJ*, 22:708 (November, 1897).
44. "Columbian University Library Course," *LJ*, 29:85 (February, 1904).
45. "Columbian University Library School," *LJ*, 29:548 (October, 1904).

46. Mary Jane Sibley, "Origin and Growth of the Syracuse University Library School," Syracuse University Library School *The Chronicle*, 8:2 (May, 1937).
47. *Annual of the Syracuse University for the Collegiate Year, 1893-94* (Syracuse, N.Y.: E. M. Grover, 1893), p.47.
48. *Syracuse University [Catalogue] I. College of Liberal Arts. II. College of Fine Arts. III. College of Medicine. IV. College of Law. Collegiate Year, 1897-98* (Syracuse, N.Y.: University Press, Eaton & Mains, 1898), pp.90-91.
49. Mary Jane Sibley, *op. cit.*
50. See p.82.
51. See p.108.
52. "Syracuse School of Library Science Faculty, 1897-1937," Syracuse University Library School *The Chronicle*, 8:1 (May, 1937). For additional information on the history of the School, see Elizabeth G. Thorne, "The Syracuse University Library School," *LJ*, 47:[1021] (December, 1922).  
The first references to Syracuse which appeared in the *Library Journal* were: "Syracuse, N.Y., University," *LJ*, 26:355 (June, 1901), and "Syracuse, N.Y., University," *LJ*, 26:830 (November, 1901).
53. Katharine L. Sharp, "Instruction in Library Economy through University Extension Methods," *LJ*, 23:75-78 (August, 1898). Mrs. Dixon was referred to as the "assistant librarian"; however, University records identify her as the "associate librarian."
54. "University of Chicago Library Classes," *LJ*, 22:22 (January, 1897); "Illinois Library Association," *ibid.*, pp.28-29.
55. University of Chicago, *The President's Report, July, 1892 - July, 1902* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1903), p.332.
56. University of Chicago, *The President's Report, July, 1902 - July, 1904* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1905), pp.169, 171.
57. *Ibid.*, p.173.
58. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1903," *LJ*, 28:86-90 (July, 1903). See pp.108-13 of this book for an analysis of the report.
59. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1894," *LJ*, 19:119-20 (December, 1894).
60. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1893," *LJ*, 18:44 (September, 1893).
61. "Denver (Colo.) City L[ibrary]," *LJ*, 18:481 (November, 1893).
62. Chalmers Hadley, *John Cotton Dana: A Sketch* ("American Library Pioneers," No. V; Chicago: A.L.A., 1943), p.22.
63. "Springfield (Mass.) City L.," *LJ*, 23:544 (September, 1898); "Springfield (Mass.) City Library Training Class," *LJ*, 23:678 (December, 1898).
64. W. H. Brett, "Summer School of Cleveland Public Library," *LJ*, 23:68 (August, 1898).
65. "Cleveland Summer School," *LJ*, 23:677 (December, 1898).
66. "Gifts and Bequests," *LJ*, 15:187-88 (June, 1900).
67. "Pittsburgh, Pa., Carnegie L. (1st rpt.—year ending Ap. 1, '96)," *LJ*, 21:298 (June, 1896); Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, "Librarian's Annual Report [from April 1, 1895, to April 1, 1896]," Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, *Bulletin*, 1:110-11 (May, 1896).
68. *First Annual Report to the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh*, to January 31, 1897 (Pittsburgh, 1897), p.13.
69. *Third Annual Reports to the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh*, for the Year Ending January 31, 1899 (Pittsburgh, 1899), pp.21-24.
70. *Fifth Annual Reports to the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh*, for the Year Ending January 31, 1901 (Pittsburgh, 1901), pp.29-30;

"Training Class for Children's Librarians at Pittsburgh Carnegie Library," *LJ*, 25:333 (July, 1900).

71. "Carnegie Library Training School," *LJ*, 26:697 (September, 1901).
72. See pp.82-84.
73. *Eighth Annual Reports to the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh*, for the Year Ending January 31, 1904 (Pittsburgh, 1904), p.27.  
For more information on the contributions of Andrew Carnegie toward the training of librarians, see pp.118-21 of this book.
74. Harriet H. Stanley, "Summer Library Schools and Classes," *LJ*, 23:75 (August, 1898).
75. Katharine L. Sharp, "Wisconsin Summer School of Library Science," *LJ*, 21:192-93 (April, 1896).
76. Minnesota State Public Library Commission, *First Biennial Report, 1899-1900* (Minneapolis: North State Printing Company, 1901), p.16.
77. "Another Summer School," *Public Libraries*, 3:157 (May, 1898); "Ohio State University Summer School," *LJ*, 23:158 (April, 1898).
78. "University of Nebraska, Lincoln," *LJ*, 25:707 (November, 1900).
79. "Colorado State Normal School," *LJ*, 24:71 (February, 1899); "Library Handicraft at Colorado State Normal School," *LJ*, 14:335 (July, 1900).
80. R. R. Bowker, "The Riverside Library Service School and Its Founder," *LJ*, 46:[893]-95 (November 1, 1921).
81. Williamson I, pp.207-14. This part of the report has not yet been published.
82. Melvil Dewey, "Summer Session of the Library School," *Library Notes*, 4:232 (July, 1895); "New York State Library School," *LJ*, 20:176 (May, 1895); "Summer Course in Library Science: Albany, N.Y.," *LJ*, 21:239 (May, 1896).
83. "Chautauqua Summer School for Library Training," *LJ*, 26:220-21 (April, 1901); "Chautauqua Library School," *LJ*, 26:697-98 (September, 1901).
84. "Wisconsin Library Association," *LJ*, 20:94 (March, 1895).
85. Katharine L. Sharp, "Wisconsin Summer School of Library Science," *LJ*, 21:192-93 (April, 1896).
86. "Wisconsin F. L. Commission: F. A. Hutchins, Secretary," *LJ*, 24:216 (May, 1899).
87. "Wisconsin F. L. Commission: Miss L. E. Stearns, Secretary," *LJ*, 22:25 (January, 1897).
88. "Marvin, Miss Cornelia," *LJ*, 24:232 (May, 1899).
89. "Wisconsin Library School," *LJ*, 31:134-39 (March, 1906).
90. "University of Wisconsin," *LJ*, 26:592 (November, 1911).
91. For example, a factual account of summer programs is to be found in a thesis by Gladys Ford, "Contribution of the Commission Type of Summer Library School to Professional Training" (unpublished Master's thesis, Library School, Univ. of Illinois, 1931).

## Chapter VI

### *In the last decade: proposals and recommendations*

1. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1893," *LJ*, 18:75 (September, 1893).
2. American Library Association, "Meeting of the Executive Board, November 10, 1893," *LJ*, 18:513 (December, 1893).
3. "New York Library Club," *LJ*, 18:195 (June, 1893).
4. M. Petherbridge, "The American Library School," *The Library*, 7:70 (March[?], 1895).
5. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1894," *LJ*, 19:119-20 (December, 1894).

6. C. E. Lowrey, "The University Library, Its Larger Recognition in Higher Education," *LJ*, 19:267 (August, 1894).
7. "The Library Schools and Training Classes of the United States," *LJ*, 19:296-308 (September, 1894). This may be regarded as the first "Who's Who in Library Service," for it was a directory, arranged by programs, of all the graduates grouped by class. Williamson proposed the publication of a similar "Who's Who" in his original report to the Carnegie Corporation, but the suggestion was deleted from the published report (Williamson I, p.148).
8. William I. Fletcher, *Public Libraries in America* ("Columbian Knowledge Series," No. II, 2nd ed.; Boston: Roberts Bros., 1895), pp.[80]-84.
9. P. L. F., "Review of *Public Libraries in America*, by William I. Fletcher," *LJ*, 19:237-38 (July, 1894).
10. Aksel G. S. Josephson, "Is Librarianship a Learned Profession?" *Public Libraries* 1:195 (September, 1896).
11. *Ibid.*, p.196.
12. Williamson II, p.142.
13. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1896," *LJ*, 21:95 (December, 1896).
14. American Library Association, "Report of Committee on Library Schools, 1896-1897," *LJ*, 22:88-89 (October, 1897).
15. *Ibid.*, pp.19-27.
16. *Ibid.*, pp.28-31.
17. Mary Salome Cutler, "The Children's Librarian," *LJ*, 22:292 (June, 1897).
18. Mary Wright Plummer, "The Work for Children in Free Libraries," *LJ*, 22:686 (November, 1897).
19. *LJ*, 23:80-82 (August, 1898).
20. American Library Association, "Transactions of the Executive Board, July 24, 1897," *LJ*, 22:696 (November, 1897).
21. Herbert Putnam, "Address of the President, Conference of Librarians, Lakewood-on-Chautauqua, N.Y., July 5-9, 1898," *LJ*, 23:[1]-6 (August, 1898).
22. "Library Schools and Training Classes," *ibid.*, pp.59-70.
23. *Ibid.*, pp.59-60.
24. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1898," *ibid.*, p.123.
25. *Ibid.*, p.124.
26. C. C. Williamson, "Some Present-Day Aspects of Library Training," *LJ*, 45:562-68 (September, 1919).
27. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1898," *LJ*, 23:136 (August, 1898).
28. *Ibid.*, p.137.
29. American Library Association, "Transactions of Executive Board, November 25, 1898," *LJ*, 23:672 (December, 1898).
30. William I. Fletcher, "Influence of Library Schools in Raising the Grade of Library Work," *LJ*, 23:70 (August, 1898).
31. William I. Fletcher, "Apprenticeship as a Means of Library Training," *ibid.*, p.83.
32. Reuben Gold Thwaites, "Apprenticeship as a Means of Library Training," *ibid.*, pp.83-84.
33. Hannah P. James, "Need of Apprenticeship for Students" [abstract], *ibid.*, pp.134-35.
34. Electra C. Doren, "Special Training for Library Work," *Public Libraries*, 4:8 (January, 1899).
35. "The Trans-Mississippi Library Congress," *LJ*, 23:571-73 (October, 1898).
36. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1899," *LJ*, 24:115-16 (July, 1899).

37. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1899," *ibid.*, p.134.
38. Aksel G. S. Josephson, "Preparation for Librarianship," *LJ*, 25:226-28 (May, 1900).
39. The summations for both "The Junior Program" and "The Senior Program" have been made from an examination of Josephson's "Preparation for Librarianship," *ibid.*, pp.226-27.
40. Reuben Gold Thwaites, "Ten Years of American Library Progress: Address of the President, Conference of Librarians, Montreal, Canada, June 7-12, 1900," *LJ*, 25:2 (August, 1900).
41. American Library Association, "Report of the Committee on Library Schools, 1899-1900," *ibid.*, pp.83-86.
42. Throughout the report, the New York State Library School was referred to as "Albany."
43. "Drexel Institute Library School," *LJ*, 25:298 (June, 1900).
44. "Pratt Institute Library School," *LJ*, 24:166 (April, 1899).
45. "New York State Library School," *LJ*, 25:341 (July, 1900).
46. "University of Illinois State Library School," *LJ*, 25:596 (September, 1900).
47. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1900," *LJ*, 25:112 (August, 1900).
48. "New York Library Association, 1900," *LJ*, 25:646 (October, 1900).
49. *Ibid.*
50. American Library Association, "Report of the Committee on Library Schools, 1899-1900," *LJ*, 25:86 (August, 1900).
51. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1900," *ibid.*, p.113.
52. American Library Association, "Transactions of Council and Executive Board, June, 1900," *LJ*, 25:293 (June, 1900).
53. *Ibid.*
54. American Library Association, "Transactions of the Executive Board, November 2, 1900," *LJ*, 25:691 (November, 1900).
55. American Library Association, "Committee Appointments," *LJ*, 26:213 (April, 1901).
56. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1900," *LJ*, 25:138 (August, 1900).

#### *Chapter VII*

#### *Into the twentieth century: from 1901 to 1905*

1. "Library Examinations and Methods of Appointments," *LJ*, 26:323-24 (June, 1901).
2. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1901," *LJ*, 26:685-86 (September, 1901).
3. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1902," *LJ*, 27:136 (July, 1902).
4. American Library Association, "Meeting of Executive Board, December 9, 1902," *LJ*, 27:1016 (December, 1902); American Library Association, "Committee Appointments," *LJ*, 28:25 (January, 1903).
5. American Library Association, "Professional Instruction in Bibliography: Round Table Meeting, July 10, 1901," *LJ*, 26:197-205 (August, 1901).
6. Katharine L. Sharp, "Library Schools on a Graduate Basis," in Association of Collegiate Alumnae, *Publications*, Series 3, No. 5 (February, 1902), pp.24, 32.
7. "District of Columbia Library Association, April 17, 1901," *LJ*, 26:279 (May, 1901).
8. New York State Library, "16th Annual Report of New York State Library School," New York State University, *Bulletin*, 277:216-17 (February, 1903).

9. "Chautauqua Summer School for Library Training," *LJ*, 26:220 (April, 1901); "Chautauqua Library School," *LJ*, 26:698 (September, 1901).

The story of Chautauqua is to be found in Jesse Lyman Hurlbut, *The Story of Chautauqua* (New York: Putnam, 1921). A reference to the summer library school appears on p.283. Dewey had proposed the establishment of a summer school at Chautauqua as early as 1888 in *Library Notes*.

10. *Public Libraries*, 7:119-20 (March, 1902).
11. *Ibid.*, p.120. Dewey's implication that an association composed of a few properly equipped library schools might have to be formed was the first public proposal that there be such an organization. The genealogically minded might trace the origin of the Association of American Library Schools to Dewey's public announcement of the need for such an association in 1902.
12. See pp.107-13 for an analysis of the 1903 Report.
13. "University of Texas, Course in Library Training," *LJ*, 26:889-90 (December, 1901); "Wyche, Benjamin," *LJ*, 28:195-96 (April, 1903).
14. See pp.59-61.
15. ["Development of Library Training"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 26:[315] (June, 1901).
16. Mary Wright Plummer, "Training for Librarianship," *ibid.*, pp.317-23.
17. "'Library Week' Meeting of the New York Library Association," *LJ*, 27:885 (October, 1902).
18. *Ibid.*, p.890.
19. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1902," *LJ*, 27:140 ([July?], 1902).
20. "'Library Week' Meeting of the New York Library Association," *LJ*, 27:891 (October, 1902).
21. Lutie Stearns, secretary of the Western Library Meeting, informed the New York meeting of the appointment of the committee, but there is no mention of it in the detailed report of the meeting itself ("Western Library Meeting," *LJ*, 27:825-33 [September, 1902]).
22. "'Library Week' Meeting of the New York Library Association," *LJ*, 27:891 (October, 1902).
23. ["The 'Courageous Committees'"—editorial comment], *Public Libraries*, 8:153 (April, 1903).
24. *Public Libraries*, 8:208-20 (May, 1903).
25. ["Illinois Library Association Meeting, 1903"—editorial comment], *ibid.*, p.237.
26. American Library Association, "Committee Appointments," *LJ*, 28:25 (January, 1903); American Library Association, "Officers and Committees Serving in 1902-03 and during the Niagara Falls Conference," *LJ*, 28:232 (July, 1903).
27. "Library Training Course at Simmons College," *LJ*, 27:783 (August, 1902); "Simmons College Library Training Course," *LJ*, 27:966 (November, 1902).
28. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1903," *LJ*, 28:83-101 (July, 1903).
29. *Ibid.*, pp.83-85.
30. Data for this section were extracted from pp.86-90 of the 1903 Report. The names of the schools conform to those used in the Report, for example, Chicago University rather than University of Chicago.
31. Identified as "schools which have always reported to the American Library Association."
32. Data for this section were extracted from pp.90-92 of the 1903 Report. The Report stated that ten programs had responded to the questionnaires, but only nine were identified by name.
33. Data for this section were extracted from pp.92-97 of the 1903 Report.

34. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1903," *ALA Bulletin*, 28:152-55 (July, 1903).
35. American Library Association, "Transactions of Council and Executive Board, June 22-26, 1903," *LJ*, 28:226 (July, 1903).
36. ["Library Training"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 28:592 (August, 1903).
37. Mary Jane Sibley, "A Voice from Syracuse University," *Public Libraries*, 9:18-20 (January, 1904).
38. "Columbian University Library Course," *LJ*, 29:86 (February, 1904).
39. See pp.81-82 and 90-92.
40. "Columbian University Library School," *LJ*, 29:548 (October, 1904).
41. Letter from Mary Wright Plummer, September 9, 1910 (in the files of the Oberlin College Library). The comment, in pencil, was appended to a letter, addressed to Azariah S. Root, in which she offered some suggestions on formulating the plans for a second examination of library schools.
42. "Lake Placid Library Week [1903]," *Public Libraries*, 8:420-24 (November, 1903).
43. "'Library Week' of New York Library Association [1903]," *LJ*, 28:721 (October, 1903).
44. ["Two Aspects of Library Training"—editorial comment], *ibid.*, p.695.
45. Williamson II, p.76.
46. *Ibid.*, p.142.
47. ["Letter of a Library Student"—editorial comment], *Public Libraries*, 8:272 (June, 1903).
48. "A Word from a Library School Student," *Public Libraries*, 8:316 (July, 1903).
49. "Another Word from Another Library Student," *Public Libraries*, 9:86 (February, 1904).
50. "University of Illinois State Library School," *LJ*, 28:731 (October, 1903).
51. William Warner Bishop, Review of *Syllabus for a Course of Study in the History of the Evolution of the Library in Europe and America*: Thesis for the Degree of Bachelor of Library Science in the State Library School of the University of Illinois, presented June, 1903, by Frances Simpson, *LJ*, 28:848-51 (December, 1903).
52. Williamson II, p.[34].
53. See pp.57-59.
54. "Carnegie Endowment for Library Training School," *LJ*, 28:118 (March, 1903).
55. ["The Carnegie Library School Endowment to Western Reserve"—editorial comment], *ibid.*, p.103.
56. ["Western Reserve: Extracts from the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*"—editorial comment], *Public Libraries*, 8:152 (April, 1903).
57. Ohio Library Association, "Proceedings of a Sixth Annual Meeting," *Public Libraries*, 5:358-60 (November, 1900).
58. Linda A. Eastman, *Portrait of a Librarian* (Chicago: A.L.A., 1940), p.48. Miss Eastman makes no reference, however, to the work of the committee with which Brett had been associated.
59. "For a Library School at Western Reserve University," *LJ*, 26:336 (June, 1901).
60. C. C. Williamson, Statement Prepared for the Use of Miss Sarah K. Vann, June, 1955, p.8 (in the files of Vann).
61. *Eighth Annual Reports to the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh*, for the Year Ending January 31, 1904 (Pittsburgh, 1904), p.27.
62. "Carnegie Library Training School for Children's Librarians," *LJ*, 28:252 (May, 1903).
63. Elva S. Smith, "The Carnegie Library School—a Bit of History," *LJ*, 46:791-94 (October 1, 1921).

64. "Atlanta, Ga. Carnegie L.," *LJ*, 30:236 (April, 1905); "Southern Library School: Carnegie Library of Atlanta," *LJ*, 30:363 (June, 1905). The name was changed in 1907 to the Library Training School of the Carnegie Library of Atlanta ("Southern Library School," *LJ*, 32:375 [August, 1907]).  
Additional information on the School may be found in Anne Wallace Howland, "The Library Movement in the South since 1899," *LJ*, 32:253-58 (June, 1907).
65. "New York Public Library School," *LJ*, 26:303 (June, 1911).
66. Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Memorandum concerning Library Schools, 1918* [New York, 1918], p.3 (in the files of the Corporation).
67. See Chapter XI for information on the inquiries of the Carnegie Corporation.

### Chapter VIII

#### *In pursuit of library training standards, 1905-6*

1. American Library Association, "Transactions of Council and Executive Board," *LJ*, 29:250 (December, 1904).
2. *Ibid.*
3. Melvil Dewey, "National Library Institute," *Public Libraries*, 9:16-18 (January, 1904).
4. "Anderson, Edwin Hatfield," *LJ*, 30:48 (January, 1905).
5. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report on Standards of Library Training," *LJ*, 30:121-23 (September, 1905).
6. American Library Association, "Meeting of Executive Board, January 11, 1906," *LJ*, 31:75 (February, 1906).
7. American Library Association, "Transactions of Council and Executive Board, July, 1905," *LJ*, 30:196 (September, 1905).
8. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1905," *ibid.*, pp.164-76.
9. Lutie E. Stearns, "The Question of Library Training," *ibid.*, pp.68-71.
10. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1905," *ibid.*, p.170.
11. *Ibid.*, pp.167-68.
12. Frances Jenkins Olcott, "Rational Library Work with Children and the Preparation for It," *ibid.*, pp.71-75. The speech was read by Anderson H. Hopkins.
13. *Ibid.*, p.173.
14. "The New York State Library and Mr. Dewey's Retirement," *LJ*, 30:800 (October, 1905).
15. *Public Libraries*, 10:435-38 (October, 1905).
16. Letter from Melvil Dewey, April 30, 1901 (in the archives of the Library of the University of California).
17. See pp.46-50.
18. ["Library Schools and Their Ideals"—editorial comment], *Public Libraries*, 11:112 (March, 1906).
19. "Letters from Librarians Who Have Been in the Schools," *ibid.*, pp.137-43.
20. Irene Warren, "The Library School Problem," *Public Libraries*, 11:541-43 (December, 1906).
21. ["Library Schools and Their Ideals"—editorial comment], *Public Libraries*, 11:112 (March, 1906).
22. "Library Schools," *ibid.*, pp.116-31.
23. "Summer Library Schools," *ibid.*, pp.131-34.
24. "Training Classes in Libraries," *ibid.*, pp.134-36.
25. The Indiana State Normal School, Terre Haute, established a department of public school library science during the school year, 1905-6, under the direction of Arthur Cunningham, librarian. Three courses, constituting a



year's work, were offered: course 1 was designed to "prepare the teacher for intelligent, systematic, and scholarly use of collections of books," and courses 2 and 3 were concerned with "the organization and management of school libraries" ("Indiana State Normal School, Terre Haute [Ind.]," *LJ*, 31:190 [April, 1906]).

26. The *Year-book* for June, 1906, of the Kansas State Normal School included several courses in library training, one of which, the *Advanced Course*, led to the degree of A.B. in education with library science as a major study to be pursued over a period of four years. The course, essentially an expansion of the summer course for librarians, included, in addition, "typewriting, library history, organization and administration, bookmaking, children's literature, selection of books, books and authors, and library news" (Kansas State Normal School, Emporia, Kansas, *Year-book*, 5:242-45 [No. 6, June, 1906; Topeka: State Print. Off., 1906]).

The Department of Library Science was under the direction of Gertrude Amelia Buck, a graduate of the Platteville, Wisconsin, State Normal School and of the University of Illinois State Library School, 1904. She had had experience as reference librarian of the Platteville Normal School, as a teacher of the district schools, and as a high school assistant. She had served as instructor in Library, Kansas State Normal School, in the summer session of 1904 and had been with the department since 1905 (*ibid.*, p.17).

Note: *The history of the development of library training courses in normal schools is yet to be studied.*

27. ["Library Schools and Their Ideals"—editorial comment], *Public Libraries*, 11:112 (March, 1906).
28. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1906," *LJ*, 31:177 (August, 1906).
29. Though the name was not associated with the position held in the announcement concerning Committee appointments, it was comparatively simple to identify the person according to his qualification by checking the attendance records at the conferences and the lists of graduates from the various schools.
30. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1906," *ibid.*, p.175.
31. *Ibid.*, pp.175-76. The standards appear in the form cited except for the addition of the numerals identifying specific aspects such as b. (4), which refers to the inclusion of questions of economics in the entrance examinations given by the various schools.
32. Another topic was recommended for inclusion in the library school curricula even while the Committee on Library Training was formulating its standards; the recommendation, made by the Committee on Publicity, was the first made by a committee other than the officially appointed Committee on Library Training, and it was simply "that the library schools add to their courses one on how to prepare material relating to the library for the press" (American Library Association, Committee on Publicity, "Report, 1906," *ibid.*, p.216).

The unusual recommendation no doubt reflected the Committee's frustration in attempting to gather data rather than its concern for the curriculum as such, for the Committee, composed of J. C. Dana, J. H. Ranck, and Purd B. Wright, had encountered many problems as they attempted to stimulate interest in the field. In one instance the Committee received only 79 responses to 232 inquiries. As far as is known, the American Library Association took no formal steps to implement the captious recommendation from the Committee on Publicity (*ibid.*, p.214).

33. "New York State Library [School]," *LJ*, 27:149 (March, 1902).
34. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1903," *LJ*, 28:86 (July, 1903).
35. See pp.108-11.
36. See pp.114-15.
37. In March, 1906, the Wisconsin Free Library Commission announced that a library school would be opened at the beginning of the university year, September 26, 1906, and that entrance examinations would be held on July 25. Andrew Carnegie contributed indirectly to the Wisconsin School by enlarging his gift to the city of Madison for its new library building, which, when enlarged, provided a permanent home for the library school ("Wisconsin Library School," *LJ*, 31:134 [March, 1906]).
38. The Indiana Library School, conducted under the auspices of the Indiana Public Library Commission, was opened in the Winona Technical Institute, Indianapolis, Indiana, in November, 1905. It was offered as a one-year course, and Merica Hoagland, of the Indiana Library Commission, was director of the program ("Indiana Library School," *LJ*, 30:816 [October, 1905]).
39. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1906," *LJ*, 31:176 (August, 1906). The report stated that Wisconsin expected to add a month of practical library work to its entrance requirement, which was at that time an examination.
40. In its failure to meet the standards on "Test and Credentials," the School was actually making more of a valuable contribution in certifying for performance in a specific type of library service, since the School was preparing for children's librarians.

Within the following year Pratt Institute would have been similarly criticized, for in the 1907 report Miss Plummer announced that in the future Pratt would offer special training for children's librarians which would necessitate a six months' paid apprenticeship at the end of the regular course and that only *after* that apprenticeship had been successfully completed could the school recommend students as children's librarians (American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1907," *ALA Bulletin*, 1:110 [July, 1907]).

41. Simmons seemed to be performing conscientiously in not granting certificates until the student had proved himself qualified by having worked three months successfully in a library.
42. *Ibid.*, p.177.
43. *Ibid.*, pp.176-77. The wording of the standards has been changed slightly for the sake of uniformity.
44. One member of the Committee wanted to include the requirement that all instructors have had experience in a *small* library (*ibid.*, p.176). The requirement was not included, however, since it was a minority opinion.
45. *Ibid.*, p.177. Factual accounts of the summer programs included in the 1906 report are to be found in Gladys Ford, "Contribution of the Commission Type of Summer Library School to Professional Training" (unpub. Master's thesis, Library School, University of Illinois, 1931). The school referred to as "Washington" was presumably the Washington State Summer School for Library Training, offered at the University of Washington, Seattle, under the direction of Harriet E. Howe ("Washington State Summer Library School," *LJ*, 31:232 [May, 1906]). The first course was offered in 1905 in Washington.
46. The New Jersey Library Summer School was held in Asbury Park under the sponsorship of the New Jersey Public Library Commission for five weeks in the summer of 1906; Sarah Askew was director of the program as well as organizer of the Commission (Gladys Ford, *op. cit.*, pp.45-46).

47. Because this work is concerned chiefly with the winter library schools following the establishment of standards in 1906, there will be only incidental references in the following chapters on the continuing search for standards for summer schools. A special study is yet to be made on the development of summer programs following the establishment of standards by the 1906 Committee on Library Training.
48. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1906," *LJ*, 31:223 (August, 1906).

### *Chapter IX*

#### *Activities of the Committee on Library Training: publishing a tract and establishing a section*

1. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1906," *LJ*, 31:177 (August, 1906).
2. See p.113.
3. American Library Association, Publishing Board, "A.L.A. Publishing Board, October 23-24, 1906," *LJ*, 31:775 (November, 1906).
4. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1907," *ALA Bulletin*, 1:109 (July, 1907).
5. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, *Training for Librarianship* (A.L.A. Publishing Board, "Library Tract," No. IX; Boston: A.L.A. Publishing Board, 1907).
6. *Ibid.*, pp.6-7.
7. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1908," *ALA Bulletin*, 2:199 (September, 1908).
8. *Ibid.*, p.200.
9. The *Handbook* appeared as No. 5 of the first volume of the *Bulletin* of the American Library Association, which, beginning in January, 1907, was published as a means of encouraging a "closer connection between the Association and its members" (*ALA Bulletin*, 1:[1] [January, 1907]).
10. American Library Association, "Handbook, 1907," *ALA Bulletin*, 1:22 (September, 1907).

The inclusion of the reference to the program at the University of California indicated that the editor of the *Handbook* had later information than did the Committee on Library Training, which had not referred to the resumption of the summer course at the University of California in 1906 and 1907 (Gladys Ford, "Contribution of the Commission Type of Summer Library School to Professional Training" [unpub. Master's thesis, Library School, University of Illinois, 1931]).

11. See pp.136-37.
12. See pp.132-33.
13. American Library Association, "Handbook, 1908," *ALA Bulletin*, 2:62-63 (July, 1908).
14. American Library Association, "Handbook, 1909," *ALA Bulletin*, 3:69 (July, 1909).
15. American Library Association, "Report of the Executive Board, 1910," *ALA Bulletin*, 4:678 (September, 1910).

It was not until 1922 that the names of the schools appeared again in the *Handbook*. The list of schools was preceded by the simple statement, "Library Schools Constituting the Association of American Library Schools" (American Library Association, "Handbook, 1922," *ALA Bulletin*, 16:520 [September, 1922] [the decision of the Executive Board made no reference to the omissions during the intervening years]; American Library Association,

- "Executive Board Action, December 28-31, 1921," *ALA Bulletin*, 16:18 [January, 1922]).
16. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1908," *ALA Bulletin*, 2:199 (September, 1908).
  17. American Library Association, "Minutes of the Council, June 22, 1908," *ibid.*, pp.409-10.
  18. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1906," *LJ*, 31:177 (August, 1906).
  19. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1908," *ALA Bulletin*, 2:199-202 (September, 1908).
  20. When formally established, the section was known as the Section on Professional Training rather than a Normal Section. Such a change in terminology seemed farsighted, particularly since the word "normal" was being associated increasingly with state normal schools, which were offering courses of training in the art and science of teaching.
  21. ["A Library School Teachers' Section in A.L.A."—editorial comment], *Public Libraries*, 12:58-59 (February, 1907).
  22. "Meeting of Library School Faculties at A.L.A. Conference, Asheville," *Public Libraries*, 12:276-77 (July, 1907).
  23. ["Discussion of Library Training"—editorial comment], *ibid.*, p.260.
  24. "Library School Conference," *Public Libraries*, 13:140-41 (April, 1908).
  25. American Library Association, Publishing Board, "Report, 1908," *ALA Bulletin*, 2:132 (September, 1908).
  26. For detailed information consult one of the issues, for example, Carl L. Cannon, *Publicity for Small Libraries* ("Manual of Library Economy," [No.] XXXI; Chicago: A.L.A., 1929).
  27. Williamson II, p.50. Williamson devoted an entire chapter to "Text-Books," pp.[48]-52.
  28. "A Library School Conference," *Public Libraries*, 13:140 (April, 1908).
  29. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, [Symposium on] "The Evolution of the Library School Curriculum," *ALA Bulletin*, 2:202-3 (September, 1908).
  30. Williamson II, p.38.
  31. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1909," *ALA Bulletin*, 3:225 (September, 1909).
  32. Letter from Alice Kroeger addressed "To the Council" in regard to the establishment of a Normal Section, p.3 (in the files of the Oberlin College Library).
  33. American Library Association, "Council, June 26, 1909," *ALA Bulletin*, 3:442 (September, 1909).
  34. Letter from Mary Wright Plummer addressed "To the Council" in regard to the establishment of a Normal Section, p.4 (in the files of the Oberlin College Library).
  35. American Library Association, Section on Professional Training for Librarianship, ["Meeting, July 2, 1910"], *ALA Bulletin*, 4:786 (September, 1910). The Section is sometimes referred to in the literature of the period as the Professional Training Section.
  36. American Library Association, Section on Professional Training for Librarianship, ["Meeting, May 24, 1911"], *ALA Bulletin*, 5:270 (July, 1911).
  37. Julia E. Elliott, "Library Conditions Which Confront Library Schools," *ALA Bulletin*, 3:427-36 (September, 1909).
  38. *Ibid.*, p.435.
  39. Adam J. Strohm, "Do We Need a Postgraduate Library School?" *Public Libraries*, 15:54 (February, 1910).

40. "Special Libraries Association," *LJ*, 34:358 (August, 1909).
41. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1909," *ALA Bulletin*, 3:224 (September, 1909).
42. Williamson II, pp.91-102. Williamson introduced the subject in Chapter 13, "Advanced Specialized Study," by stating, "To bring about a reasonable degree of efficiency in library service, adequate provision must be made for specialized training."
43. See pp.81-82 and 90-92.
44. American Library Association, Board of Education for Librarianship, *Annual Report* [1924-25] (Chicago: A.L.A., 1925), pp.22-25.
45. American Library Association, Section on Professional Training for Librarianship, ["Meeting, July 2, 1910"], *ALA Bulletin*, 4:776-86 (September, 1910).
46. Edith Tobitt, "The Essentials of a Good Library School," *ibid.*, pp.776-79.
47. *Ibid.*, p.779.
48. American Library Association, Section on Professional Training for Librarianship, ["Meeting, July 2, 1910"], *ibid.*, p.779.
49. *Ibid.*, p.785.
50. Williamson I, p.16. The same idea, greatly expanded, appeared in both the published and the unpublished reports: Williamson I, p.122; Williamson II, p.87.

Though Moulton was in attendance at the Saratoga Conference of 1918, at which time Williamson was making a preliminary search for persons qualified to undertake the Carnegie Corporation study, there is no evidence that Williamson conferred with Moulton or that he ever knew that Moulton had advanced his objections to the expenditure of public funds for library training as early as 1910.

51. Chalmers Hadley, "What Library Schools Can Do for the Profession," *ALA Bulletin*, 6:147-51 (July, 1912).
52. See p.116.
53. See pp.145-46.
54. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1912," *ALA Bulletin*, 6:151-52 (July, 1912).
55. *Ibid.*, p.155.
56. *Ibid.*, p.157.
57. American Library Association, "A.L.A. Council [January 2-3, 1913]," *ALA Bulletin*, 7:17 (January, 1913).
58. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1912," *ALA Bulletin*, 6:158 (July, 1912).
59. American Library Association, "A.L.A. Council [January 2-3, 1913]," *ALA Bulletin*, 7:16-17 (January, 1913).
60. *Ibid.*, p.18.

## Chapter X

### *The library schools: from 1911 to 1919*

1. "James Ingersoll Wyer, Jr.," *LJ*, 33:251 (June, 1908).
2. "Sharp, Miss Katharine L.," *LJ*, 32:297 (June, 1907).
3. "Drexel Institute Library School," *LJ*, 25:34 (January, 1910).
4. "Rathbone, Miss Josephine Adams," *LJ*, 36:440 (August, 1911).
5. "Wilson, Albert S.," *LJ*, 32:473 (October, 1907).
6. "Windsor, Phineas L.," *LJ*, 34:85 (February, 1909).
7. "University of Illinois Library School," *LJ*, 35:470 (October, 1910).
8. "University of Illinois Library School," *LJ*, 36:132 (March, 1911).
9. Mary Emogene Hazeltine, "Methods of Training in One Library School," *LJ*, 34:253-56 (June, 1909).

10. "New York Public Library School," *LJ*, 36:303 (June, 1911).
  11. "New York Public Library School," *LJ*, 36:376 (July, 1911).
  12. "Plummer, Miss Mary W.," *LJ*, 36:439-40 (August, 1911).
  13. See p.105.
  14. "St. Louis Library School," *LJ*, 42:325 (April, 1917).
  15. "University of Washington Library School," *ibid.*, pp.324-25.
  16. American Library Association, Section on Professional Training for Librarianship, ["Meeting, July 2, 1910"], *ALA Bulletin*, 4:786 (September, 1910).
  17. Windsor indicated that the letter would be sent to those schools listed "on page 368 of Bostwick's American Public Library" (letter [of invitation] from Phineas L. Windsor, December 9, 1910, p.1. The letter bore the signatures also of Miss Hazeltine and Miss Whittlesey).
  18. *Ibid.*
  19. The questions were later included in the report of the first meeting though not in the same order in which they had appeared on the tentative list ("Meeting of Library School Instructors," *LJ*, 36:69-70 [February, 1911]; *ALA Bulletin*, 5:25-26 [March, 1911]).
  20. Miss Lyman's lecture circuit aptly demonstrated the contribution which could be made by a peripatetic lecturer; for example, she lectured in the month of February, 1909, at the Carnegie Library of Atlanta Training School and in April, 1910, at the University of Illinois Library School ("Carnegie Library of Atlanta Training School, Atlanta, Ga.," *LJ*, 34:228 [May, 1909]; "University of Illinois Library School," *LJ*, 35:218-19 [May, 1910]).
  21. "Meeting of Library School Instructors," *ALA Bulletin*, 5:25 (March, 1911).
  22. Phineas L. Windsor, "Account of the Winter Meetings of Library School Instructors," *ALA Bulletin*, 7:351-52 (July, 1913).
  23. Minutes of the meeting of the Round Table of Library Schools, Chicago, [January 1], 1915, p.7 (in the files of the Association of American Library Schools).
  24. "Conference of Library School Faculties, Chicago, January 3, 1912," *ALA Bulletin*, 6:16-17 (January, 1912).
  25. Minutes of a Round Table of Library School Faculties, held at Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill., on January 2, 1913, pp.1-6 (in the files of the Association of American Library Schools).
- The discussion of co-operation in obtaining lecturers on a co-operative plan recalls a similar discussion at the 1908 meeting of library school teachers (see p.143).
26. Minutes of meeting of Association of American Library Schools, Albany, N.Y., June 29-30, 1915, p.6 (in the files of the Association).
  27. Minutes of the meeting of the Round Table of Library Schools, Chicago, [January 1], 1915, p.7 (in the files of the Association of American Library Schools). The scheduling of 2559 hours for practice work does appear excessive. Though the schools requiring such extensive practice are not identified in the minutes, it is possible that two of them were the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh and the New York Public Library, both of which paid students as regular assistants during the second year and consequently devoted more time to practice work.
  28. *Ibid.*, pp.9-10.
  29. Williamson II, p.59. Williamson I, p.84, refers to a "period of practical work" rather than to "field practice."
  30. Minutes of a Round Table of Library School Instructors, held at Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill., on January 2, 1913, p.6.
  31. Williamson II, p.100.
  32. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1912," *ALA Bulletin*, 6:113 (July, 1912).

33. Letter from Phineas L. Windsor, February 2, 1912 (in the files of Oberlin College Library).
  34. *Ibid.*; letter from Frank K. Walter, January 27, 1912 (in the files of Oberlin College Library).
  35. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1912," *ALA Bulletin*, 6:113 (July, 1912).
  36. American Library Association, "Executive Board, January 3, 1912," *ALA Bulletin*, 6:6 (January, 1912).
  37. Letter from Azariah Smith Root, October 2, 1911 (in the files of the Oberlin College Library). The Flexner study, fully identified, is: Abraham Flexner, *Medical Education in the United States and Canada: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; With an Introduction by Henry S. Pritchett* ("Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: Bulletin," No. 4; New York City, c1910).
  38. Letter from Mary Wright Plummer, October 5, 1911 (in the files of the Oberlin College Library).
  39. Memorandum from Root, "To the Members of the Committee on Library Training of the American Library Association," November 25, 1911, pp.2-3 (in the files of the Oberlin College Library).
  40. American Library Association, "Executive Board, January 1-3, 1913," *ALA Bulletin*, 7:3 (January, 1913).
  41. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1913," *ALA Bulletin*, 7:134-36 (July, 1913).
  42. See p.134.
  43. See p.110.
  44. Minutes of the meeting of the Round Table of Library Schools, Chicago, [January 1], 1915, pp.7-9 (in the files of the Association of American Library Schools).
  45. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1914," *ALA Bulletin*, 8:105-6 (May, 1914).
  46. Letter from Mary Wright Plummer, September 30, 1912; letter from Azariah Smith Root, February 22, 1913 (in the files of the Oberlin College Library).
  47. Letter from Mary Wright Plummer, September 30, 1912 (in the files of the Oberlin College Library).
  48. Letter from Azariah Smith Root, February 6, 1914 (in the files of the Oberlin College Library); "Robbins, Mary Esther," *LJ*, 38:378 (June, 1913).
  49. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1914," *ALA Bulletin*, 8:106 (May, 1914).
  50. Minutes of meeting, December 29-30, 1915, Association of American Library Schools, p.9 (in the files of the Association).
  51. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1915," *ALA Bulletin*, 9:227 (July, 1915).
- For information on the California State Library School consult: California State Library School, "Circular and Announcement of the California State Library School—1916-1917," *News Notes of California Libraries*, 11:14-17 (January, 1916).
52. *Ibid.*
  53. Stenographic report of the meeting, December 29-30, 1915, Association of American Library Schools, pp.99-100 (in the files of the Association).
  54. Williamson II, p.143.
  55. Minutes of meeting of Association of American Library Schools, Chicago, Ill., December 29-30, 1915, p.2 (in the files of the Association).
  56. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1916," *ALA Bulletin*, 10:348 (July, 1916).

57. Stenographic report of the meeting, December 30, 1916, Association of American Library Schools, pp.30-33 (in the files of the Association).  
Just what happened to the material is not known. It was not, in 1956, in the Root papers, which were examined in the Oberlin College Library.
58. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1916," *ALA Bulletin*, 10:348 (July, 1916).
59. Minutes of the meeting of the Round Table of Library Schools, Chicago, [January 1], 1915, p.[1] (in the files of the Association); American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1915," p.229.
60. Minutes of meeting of Association of American Library Schools, Albany, N.Y., June 29-30, 1915, p.2 (in the files of the Association).
61. Stenographic report of the meeting, December 29-30, 1915, Association of American Library Schools, p.92 (in the files of the Association).
62. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1916," *ALA Bulletin*, 10:348-49 (July, 1916).
63. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1918," *ALA Bulletin*, 12:260 (September, 1918).
64. Minutes of meeting of Association of American Library Schools, Albany, N.Y., June 29-30, 1915, p.2 (in the files of the Association).
65. Stenographic report of the meeting, December 29-30, 1915, Association of American Library Schools, pp.69-70, 77 (in the files of the Association).
66. Minutes of meeting of Association of American Library Schools, Albany, N.Y., June 29-30, 1915, pp.[1], 8-9 (in the files of the Association).
67. Minutes of meeting of Association of American Library Schools, Albany, N.Y., July 1, 1918, pp.4-8 (in the files of the Association).
68. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1920," *ALA Bulletin*, 14:284 (July, 1920).
69. Stenographic report of the meeting, June 25-26, 1923, Association of American Library Schools, p.34 (in the files of the Association).
70. ["Another Library Organization"—editorial comment], *Public Libraries*, 20:112 (March, 1915).
71. June Richardson Donnelly, "Library School Graduates" [reply to "A Wail of Despair"], *Public Libraries*, 21:259-61 (June, 1916).
72. "A Wail of Despair," *Public Libraries*, 21:215-16 (May, 1916).
73. Adelaide R. Hasse, "Women in Libraries," American Association of University Women, *Journal*, 11:[73] (October, 1917).
74. J. H. Friedel, "Training for Librarianship," *LJ*, 44:[569]-74 (September, 1919).
75. *Ibid.*, p.570.
76. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1918," *ALA Bulletin*, 12:261 (September, 1918).
77. ["Library Schools"—editorial comment], *Public Libraries*, 23:25 (January, 1918).
78. "Views of Library School Directors," *ibid.*, pp.13-19; *Public Libraries*, 23:140-41 (March, 1918).
79. Joseph F. Daniels, "What I Believe about Library Schools," *Public Libraries*, 23:18-19 (January, 1918).
80. Josephine A. Rathbone, "Pratt Institute School," *ibid.*, pp.13-14.
81. W. E. Henry, "Qualifications of the Teacher in the Library School," *Public Libraries*, 23:113-15 (March, 1918).
82. Chalmers Hadley, "Two Thoughts on Instruction in Library Schools," *LJ*, 44:585 (September, 1919).
83. "The Pacific Northwest Library Association," *LJ*, 44:735 (November, 1919).



84. American Library Association, Section on Professional Training, [Meeting, June 3, 1920], *ALA Bulletin*, 14:335 (July, 1920). It is only in the letter of Windsor of June 17, 1920, that a connection was made between Miss Kostomlatsky's report and the resolutions of the Pacific Northwest Library Association.
85. Letter from Phineas L. Windsor, June 17, 1920 (in the files of the Association of American Library Schools).
86. *LJ*, 42:[350]-55 (May, 1917).
87. "University of Washington Library School," *LJ*, 42:324-25 (April, 1917).
88. Aksel G. S. Josephson, "Training for Librarianship," *Public Libraries*, 22: 223-24 (June, 1917). The summation of the plan is based on the content of the article.

#### Chapter XI

#### *Training as viewed by an outside agency: the Carnegie Corporation of New York*

1. Frank Pierce Hill, *James Bertram: An Appreciation* (New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1936), p.49.
2. Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Memorandum*, p.4.
3. Letter from J. I. Wyer, Jr., October 29, 1915, quoted in Frank Pierce Hill, *op. cit.*, p.50.
4. *New Frontiers in Librarianship*: Proceedings of the Special Meeting of the Association of American Library Schools and the Board of Education for Librarianship of the American Library Association in Honor of the University of Chicago and Graduate Library School, December 30, 1940 (Chicago: University of Chicago, Graduate Library School, 1941), p.5.
5. Alvin S. Johnson, *A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York on the Policy of Donations to Free Public Libraries* (n.p.; n.d.), pp.1-68.
6. Frank Pierce Hill, *op. cit.*, p.35.
7. Alvin S. Johnson, *op. cit.*, p.41.
8. Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Memorandum*, p.3.
9. C. C. Williamson, "Notes on the Aims, Scope and Method of the Study of Training for Library Service, for Discussion at the Meeting of the Advisory Committee, to be held Wednesday, April 28, 1920," p.2 (typewritten copy, marked "Confidential," from the files of Williamson).
10. Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Memorandum*, "Appendix D: Biographical Data. Mr. C. C. Williamson"; "Carnegie Corporation to Study Americanization," *LJ*, 43:339 (May, 1918).
11. Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Memorandum*, "Appendix F," p.1.
12. American Library Association, "Standing Committees, 1917-18," *ALA Bulletin*, 11:[447] (November, 1917); American Library Association, "Saratoga Springs Conference, 1918, Attendance Register," *ALA Bulletin*, 12:372-78 (September, 1918).
13. Frank K. Walter, "The War and Library Training," *ALA Bulletin*, 12:98-103 (September, 1918).
14. American Library Association, Section on Professional Training, ["Ninth Annual Meeting, 1918"], *ibid.*, p.305.
15. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1918," *ibid.*, pp.260-61.
16. C. C. Williamson, "The Need of a Plan for Library Development," *LJ*, 43: 652 (September, 1918).
17. Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Memorandum*, "Appendix F."
18. Williamson II, p.[v].

19. *LJ*, 43:[649]-55 (September, 1918).
20. See pp.49-50.
21. See p.90.
22. See pp.167-68.
23. C. C. Williamson, "The Need of a Plan for Library Development," *LJ*, 43: 654 (September, 1918).
24. See pp.47-48.
25. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1907," *ALA Bulletin*, 1:108-9 (July, 1907).
26. C. C. Williamson, "The Need of a Plan for Library Development," *LJ*, 43: 653 (September, 1918).
27. See pp.86-87.
28. ["Williamson's 'The Need of a Plan for Library Development'"—editorial comment], *LJ*, 43:642 (September, 1918).
29. Carnegie Corporation of New York, *Memorandum*, p.6.
30. Stenographic report of the meeting, March 7-8, 1919, Association of American Library Schools, p.73 (in the files of the Association). Williamson, as of that date, had not been appointed director of the study. He was appointed on March 28, 1919.
31. Sarah C. N. Bogle, Discussion at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Library Schools, Atlantic City, March 8, 1919, [on] "Need of a Plan for Library Development," p.1 (in the files of the Association).
32. Minutes of meeting of Association of American Library Schools, Atlantic City, March 7-8, 1919, p.7 (in the files of the Association).
33. C. C. Williamson, "The Need of a Plan for Library Development," *LJ*, 43: 655 (September, 1918).
34. *Ibid.*, p.[649].
35. Letter from Sarah C. N. Bogle, March 31, 1919 (in the files of C. C. Williamson).
36. Williamson recognized the need of suitable textbooks for correspondence instruction, for he included in his report, as one of the reasons for allocating money for a textbook project, the need of proper textbooks for correspondence instruction (Williamson II, p.49).
37. Minutes of meeting of Association of American Library Schools, Atlantic City, March 7-8, 1919, p.8 (in the files of the Association).
38. *Ibid.*, p.9.
39. *Ibid.*
40. Stenographic report of the meeting, March 7-8, 1919, Association of American Library Schools, pp.85-88 (in the files of the Association).
41. Minutes of meeting of Association of American Library Schools, Atlantic City, March 7-8, 1919, p.9 (in the files of the Association).
42. Based on information in *Public Libraries*, which dated his visit to the Carnegie Library School of Atlanta, May 9 and 10, 1921 ("Carnegie Library, Atlanta," *Public Libraries*, 26:435 [July, 1921]). No school reported a later visit.
43. Williamson I, p.178. Statement omitted from the published report.
44. Letter to the Carnegie Corporation *in re*: Survey by Dr. C. C. Williamson on Training for Library Work, March 23, 1922 (carbon copy attached to letter from Herbert Putnam, March 30, 1922, in the files of Williamson).

### *Chapter XII*

#### *Toward a Library Training Board*

1. "Committee of Five: On a Library Survey," *ALA Bulletin*, 13:32 (March, 1919).

2. American Library Association, Committee of Five on Library Service, "Report, 1919," *ALA Bulletin*, 13:327 (July, 1919).
  3. C. C. Williamson, "Some Present-Day Aspects of Library Training," *ibid.*, p.120 (the same article appeared in *LJ*, 45:562-68 [September, 1919]).
  4. *Ibid.*, pp.120-26.
  5. *Ibid.*, p.123.
  6. American Library Association, "Proceedings, 1919," *ibid.*, p.360.
  7. American Library Association, Executive Board, ["Meeting, June 27, 1919"], *ibid.*
  8. Minutes of meeting of Association of American Library Schools, Chicago, Ill., December 31, 1919 (in the files of the Association).
  9. Letter from Frank K. Walter, June 6, 1919 (in the files of Williamson).
  10. C. C. Williamson, "Some Present-Day Aspects of Library Training," *ALA Bulletin*, 13:121 (July, 1919).
  11. Williamson I, p.169. This explanation omitted from the published report.
  12. "Heard and Seen at the A.L.A.," *Public Libraries*, 24:261 (July, 1919).
  13. Emma V. Baldwin, "The Training of Professional Librarians," *LJ*, 44:574-76 (September, 1919).
  14. "The Pacific Northwest Library Association," *LJ*, 44:735 (November, 1919).
  15. American Library Association, "Preliminary Report of Committee on Enlarged Program for American Library Service," *LJ*, 44:[645]-63 (October, 1919).
  16. *Ibid.*, pp.651-52.
  17. American Library Association, "Special A.L.A. Conference, January 1-3, 1920, The Enlarged Program Proceedings," *ALA Bulletin*, 14:72 (January, 1920).
  18. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1920," *ALA Bulletin*, 14:284 (July, 1920).
  19. *Ibid.*
  20. "Organization Meeting of the Library Workers' Association," *LJ*, 45:463-64 (May 15, 1920); "The Library Workers' Association; Draft of Organization adopted at Atlantic City, April 30, 1920," *ibid.*, pp.451-52.
  21. "The Library Workers' Association," *LJ*, 45:219 (March 1, 1920).
  22. "Constitution of the Library Workers Association," *LJ*, 45:839 (October 15, 1920).
  23. "Manley, Marian C.," *LJ*, 45:[902] (November 1, 1920).
  24. "The Library Workers Association," *LJ*, 45:800-801 (October 1, 1920); Marian C. Manley, "The Aims of the L.W.A.," *LJ*, 46:943 (November 15, 1921).
- The questionnaires and the answers thereto may be found in "Training for Librarianship," *LJ*, 47:459-60 (May 15, 1922).
25. "Library Workers' Association," *LJ*, 47:768, 770 (September 15, 1922).
  26. American Library Association, Executive Board, ["Meetings, December 31, 1919; January 1 and 3, 1920"], *ALA Bulletin*, 14:78-79 (January, 1920); "Committee Appointment," *ALA Bulletin*, 14:108 (March, 1920).
  27. American Library Association, "Reports of the Special Committee on Certification, Standardization and Library Training," *LJ*, 45:940 (November 15, 1920).
  28. American Library Association, "Proceedings of Council, June 3, 1920," *ALA Bulletin*, 14:323-24 (July, 1920).
  29. American Library Association, "Executive Board Meeting [October 11, 1920]," *LJ*, 45:987-88 (December 1, 1920).
  30. American Library Association, "Committees, 1921-1922," *LJ*, 46:760-61 (September 15, 1921).

31. The "Outline of a Tentative Scheme" of certification embraced four classes of certificates. For each class, the educational requirements, the experience, and the types of position were stated. The emphasis on training is evident in the educational requirements for Class I and Grade A of Classes II and III, which were the same:

"Education: (1) Graduation from approved college, with reading knowledge of at least one modern language other than English; and (2) not less than one year's successful study in approved library school with recommendation of school" [Class III, Grade A].

Neither the library schools nor the practicing librarians could have been unaware that Williamson's report for the Corporation would state that a college degree should be a prerequisite for admission to library schools and that library schools should offer a general professional training in a one year's course.

32. Letter addressed "To Members of the Committee on National Certification and Training," from C. C. Williamson, May 21, 1921; accompanied by a 23-page typewritten draft of "Report of A.L.A. Committee on National Certification and Training" (in the files of the Association of American Library Schools).
33. A copy of the report is included in Williamson I as "Appendix VI: Report of A.L.A. Committee on National Certification," pp.[255]-76.
34. Williamson I, p.276.
35. American Library Association, "Proceedings of Council, June 21, 1921," *ALA Bulletin*, 15:167-68 (July, 1921).
36. John Cotton Dana, "Certification and Civil Service Control," *LJ*, 46:[881] (November 1, 1921).
37. "Certification of Librarians" [from the *Boston Evening Transcript* of October 12, 1921], *ibid.*, pp.[891]-92.
38. "Midsummer [i.e., Midwinter] Meetings of A.L.A. Council: Resolution Offered by the Special Committee on National Certification and Training," *LJ*, 46:[1035]-36 (December 15, 1921).
39. "Chicago Mid-Winter Meetings, 1921," *ALA Bulletin*, 16:12-14 (January, 1922).
40. *Ibid.*, p.13.
41. American Library Association, "National Certification and Training" [Annual Report, 1922], *ALA Bulletin*, 16:210 (July, 1922).
42. "Chicago Mid-Winter Meetings; Council Meetings, December 29-30, 1922," *ALA Bulletin*, 17:17-19 (January, 1923).
43. *Ibid.*, p.18. For Williamson's requirements, see Note 31 above.
44. American Library Association, "Proceedings: Council, April 23, 1923," *ALA Bulletin*, 17:152 (July, 1923). The report of the Committee is to be found on p.197 in the section on "Annual Reports."
45. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1921," American Library Association, *Annual Reports, 1920 to 1921* (Chicago: A.L.A., 1921), p.66. The entire report may be found on pp.66-77.
46. *Ibid.*, p.69.
47. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, ["Report, 1922"], *ALA Bulletin*, 16:206-9 (July, 1922).
48. American Library Association, "Proceedings: Council, June 26, 1922," *ibid.*, p.149.
49. American Library Association, Committee on Library Training, "Report, 1923," *ALA Bulletin*, 17:194 (July, 1923).
50. *Ibid.*, p.195.

- 
51. *Ibid.*, pp.195-96.
  52. American Library Association, "Proceedings: Council, April 23, 1923," *ibid.*, p.152.
  53. American Library Association, "Proceedings: Council, April 24, 1923," *ibid.*, p.153.
  54. American Library Association, "Proceedings: Council, June 30, 1924," *ALA Bulletin*, 18:197-99 (August, 1924).

*Summary and conclusions*

1. Mary Wright Plummer, "The Pros and Cons of Training for Librarianship," *Public Libraries*, 8:213 (May, 1903).
2. Williamson II, p.38.
3. Letter from Charles C. Williamson, February 25, 1957, p.6 (in the files of Vann).

---

# Index

- Abbot, Ezra, 7
- Academic training programs, 70-73, 76
- Academy*, 20
- Accreditation, principle of, established, 189-90
- Adams, Emma Louise, 83
- Administrative aspects of training, Dewey on, 36
- Admission requirements, Dewey's circular on, 32; *see also* Entrance requirements
- Advisory committee for Williamson's study, 177
- Agency, co-ordinating and controlling, Williamson's suggestion for, 173-74, 178-79
- Agriculture, U.S. Department of, 26, 71
- Ahern, Mary Eileen, 105, 192; comments of, 117, 130-33, 142-43, 164-66
- Albany (N.Y.), Educational Church Board of, 83; *see also* New York State Library School
- Allegheny (Pa.), library in, 58
- American Bar Association, 189
- American Catalogue*, 12
- American Journal of Education*, 12, 16
- American Library Association, 9, 13, 29, 102, 188
- Board of Education for Librarianship, 190
- Bulletin*, 219 (n. 9)
- College Library Section, 112
- Committee of Five on Standardization, Certification, and Library Training, 178, 182-83, 186
- Committee of Nine on National Certification and Training, 183-87
- Committee on an Enlarged Program for American Library Service, 179, 180-83
- Committee on Library Examinations and Credentials, 87, 89, 90, 99, 100, 122; *see also* Tests and credentials
- Committee on Library Schools and Training Classes, 66, 73, 79-80, 82, 92; reports of, 69, 72, 90, 92-99, 100
- Committee on Library Training, 92, 102-3, 118, 121, 133, 165, 191, 217 (n. 32), 219 (n. 10); activities of, 138-50; and correspondence courses, 128, 174; and training standards, 132, 157-62, 164, 187-90; and Williamson, 172-73, 181-82; relations of, with schools, 162-63, 192; reports of, 73, 100-101, 105-15, 123-27, 137, 161, 165

## American Library Association (cont'd.)

- Committee on Library Training on Instruction, 124-27, 134-35, 136
- Committee on National Certification and Training, 187, 189
- Committee on Permanent Headquarters, 122-23
- Committee on Publicity, 217 (n. 32)
- Committee on System of Library Examinations and Credentials, 122; *see also* American Library Association, Committee on Library Examinations and Credentials
- Committee on the School of Library Economy, 34-38, 42-44, 104
- Conferences: and Dewey, 20, 24, 30, 34, 62; (of 1876), 4, 13, 18; (of 1877), 19; (of 1879), 20; (of 1881), 20, 23; (of 1882), 20, 21; (of 1883), 9, 19, 21, 24, 29, 34, 44, 62; (of 1885), 35-36, 41; (of 1886), 37-38; (of 1887), 41-44; (of 1888), 46, 48, 49, 55; (of 1889), 55; (of 1890), 59; (of 1891), 64, 65, 79; (of 1893), 73, 76; (of 1897), 75; (of 1898), 75, 83-89; (of 1900), 92-99; (of 1905), 59, 123, 127-29, 150; (of 1907), 142-43; (of 1908), 143-44; (of 1916), 162; (of 1918), 171-72; (of 1919), 178-81, 189; (of 1921), 184-85
- Co-operation Committee, 19
- Council, 141, 144-45, 175, 183, 187-89
- Executive Board, 138, 141, 151, 158-59, 178, 183
- Handbook*, 139-40, 179, 219-20 (n. 15)
- Manual of Library Economy*, 143
- Officers of, 8, 148, 166
- Primer*, 81
- Proceedings*, 137, 148, 162

- Publishing Board, 138, 143
- Round Table on Professional Instruction in Bibliography, 101-2
- Section on Professional Training, 142-50, 153-56, 166, 172-73, 175, 192
- Standing Committee of Three (1890-93), 56-57, 59-62, 79, 192
- Temporary Library Training Board, 2, 189-90, 192
- American Library Journal*, *see* *Library Journal*
- American Library Schools, Association of, *see* Association of American Library Schools
- American Medical Association, 189
- American Public Library, The* (Bostwick), 153
- Amherst College: Fletcher at, 8, 71, 87; graduates of, 40; summer course at, 49, 64-65, 76-77, 79-80, 84, 103-4, 111-12, 137, 208 (n. 16)
- Anderson, Edwin Hatfield, 75, 107, 123, 125, 151-53, 171
- Andrew, Kate Dean, 72
- Andrews, Clement W., 186
- Appleton, A. I., 41
- Apprenticeship, 6-7, 20-21, 87-89, 112, 126-27; Dewey on, 4, 16-17, 20, 23, 32; investigation of, 73-74, 193
- "Apprenticeship of Librarians" (Dewey), 4, 16-17, 20
- Armour Institute Library School, 72, 76-77, 81, 131; program of, 67-69, 73, 82; transfer to University of Illinois, 68-69
- Arnold, Lillian B., 131
- Asbury Park, New Jersey State Summer School in, 218 (n. 46)
- Asbury Park (N.J.) conference (1919), 178-81, 189
- Asheville (N.C.) conference (1907), 142
- Askew, Sarah, 218 (n. 46)
- Association of American Library Schools, 2, 188, 189, 192, 193; and standards, 163-64, 181; and Williamson, 172-73, 175-77, 179-80, 214 (n. 11); organized, 155, 162, 191

- Association of Collegiate Alumnae, 102  
 Astor Library, 7  
*Athenaeum*, 20  
 Atlanta, Ga., 86, 120; *see also* Carnegie Library Training School (Atlanta)
- Bailey, John Jay, 8-9  
 Baker, George Hall, 40  
 Baldwin, Emma V., 180  
 Baltimore (Md.) Library, 58  
 Balzani, Count Ugo, 201 (n. 5)  
 Barnard, F. A. P., 12, 24, 27-28, 39, 41-42, 45  
 Bean, Mary A., 35  
 Belfast (Ire.), meeting in, 79  
 Berkeley (Calif.), Dewey advocates school in, 130  
 Berry, Silas H., 86  
 Bertram, James, 171, 173, 175  
 Bibliographic training, 101-2, 112, 167-68  
 Bibliothecal Museum, 29, 202 (n. 29)  
 Billings, J. S., and Dewey, 25-27  
 Biscoe, Walter Stanley, 40, 53  
 Bishop, William Warner, 117-18, 179  
 Bogle, Sarah C. N., 171, 175-76  
 Bolton, Henry Carrington, 71  
 Book selection: courses, 156; queries on in *Library Journal*, 15  
 Boston, Mass., 8, 23, 107, 130  
 Boston Athenaeum, 8, 25, 37, 59; and Cutter, 11, 26, 35  
*Boston Evening Transcript*, 185  
 Boston (Mass.) Public Library, 6-8, 13, 20, 35  
 Bostwick, Arthur Elmore, 101, 153  
 Bowker, Richard R., 13, 27, 39, 41, 179  
 Braddock (Pa.) Library, 58  
 Brett, William Howard, 74, 86-87, 143, 149; and examinations, 89, 175; committee member, 98, 119, 142  
 British Museum, 7, 14, 18  
 Brookline (Mass.) Public Library, 35  
 Brooklyn (N.Y.) Public Library, 128, 132  
 Browne, Nina Elizabeth, 53  
 Browning, Eliza G., 98  
 Buck, Gertrude Amelia, 217 (n. 26)  
 Buffalo (N.Y.) conference (1883), 9, 19, 21, 24, 29, 34, 44, 62  
 Buffalo (N.Y.) library, 48  
 Burlington, Vt., 49  
 Burrage, Edith M., 131  
 Butler, Nicholas Murray, 40
- California, University of, 130, 157; in *A.L.A. Handbook*, 140, 219 (n. 10); summer library school, 111-12, 137, 161  
 Carlyle, Thomas, 54  
 Carnegie, Andrew, 58-59, 118-22; library donations of, 63, 75-77, 152, 169, 218 (n. 37)  
 Carnegie Corporation of New York, and Williamson's study, 1, 3, 67, 76, 120-21, 148, 152, 168-78, 192-93  
 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 158  
 Carnegie Library (Atlanta), 120  
 Carnegie Library (Pittsburgh), 84, 120, 123, 132, 152  
 Carnegie Library Training School (Atlanta), 132, 140, 154, 163; in *A.L.A. Handbook*, 140  
 Carnegie Library Training School (Pittsburgh), 74-76, 143, 163, 171; for children's librarians, 74-76, 84, 107-11, 120, 128, 132, 135, 140, 154-55, 157; in *A.L.A. Handbook*, 140  
 Carr, Henry J., 26  
 "Case method," 30  
 Cataloging: queries on in *Library Journal*, 15; teaching of, time allocated, 93-94; training for, 36  
 Catskill (N.Y.) conference (1888), 46, 48, 49, 55  
*Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 81  
 Certificates and certification, 70-71, 99, 105, 122-37, 179-80, 184-86, 192; *see also* Standards, library training  
 Chamberlain, Mellen, 20, 25-27, 39, 44  
 Chapman, Lilian Howe, 45  
 Chautauqua (N.Y.) conference (1898), 75, 84-89  
 Chautauqua Institution summer school, 49, 76, 103, 111-12, 132, 137, 140, 172  
 Chicago, Ill., 25, 67, 130; conference (1893), 73, 76



- Chicago, University of, 68, 70, 72-73, 103, 108, 115, 135, 161
- Chicago Library Club, 90
- Children's work, training for, 75, 82-84, 218 (n. 40); *see also* Carnegie Library Training School (Pittsburgh)
- Cincinnati (Ohio) conference (1882), 20, 21
- Cincinnati (Ohio) Public Library, 26, 132
- Circulars of information (Dewey), 29-33, 36-38, 55, 57, 203 (n. 36)
- Clark, S. N., 11
- Classification and Subject Index for Cataloguing and Analyzing the Books and Pamphlets of a Library*, A (Dewey), 18
- Clerical and professional aspects of training, 37, 172
- Cleveland Plain Dealer*, quoted, 119
- Cleveland (Ohio) Public Library, 72, 74-75, 84, 86, 119, 172
- Coe, Ellen M., 39
- Cole, Charles N., 159
- Cole, George Watson, 45, 79
- College degrees, and library training, 35, 36, 38, 45; *see also* Entrance requirements
- College libraries, and Williamson, 172
- College Libraries as Aids to Instruction*, 11
- "College Library, The" (Winsor), 11
- Colorado State Normal School, 76, 80
- Columbia College School of Library Economy: and American Library Association, 24-28, 34-38; atmosphere criticized, 56; established, 1-2, 4-5, 10, 17-18, 21-38; from 1887 to 1889, 39-50; transferred to Albany, 50-52, 53, 206 (n. 63)
- Columbian Exposition, 62
- Columbian University, 70-71, 103, 108-11, 114-15, 135
- "Communications" (*Library Journal*), 14-15
- Compensation, librarians', 172
- Conference of Librarians of All Nations (London, 1877), 14, 22
- Construction of Library Buildings* (Poole), 11
- "Consulting Librarianship" (Dewey), 20
- "Cooperation," queries on in *Library Journal*, 15
- Co-operative lectures, 142-43
- Corcoran Scientific School, 70
- Correspondence courses, 47-48, 113, 126-28, 188; and Williamson, 173-74, 176
- Crawford, Esther, 63, 74
- Credentials, *see* Tests and credentials
- Crestadoro, Andrea, 22
- Criticism
- of faculties, 117, 130-31, 166
  - of training programs, 40-44, 58-62, 95-98, 101-21, 164-67; in 1903, 110-11, 116-18; in 1906, 130-32; in 1915-19, 164-68
- Crunden, F. M., 26, 92, 98, 128, 202 (n. 17)
- Cunningham, Arthur, 216-17 (n. 25)
- Curriculum content, 30-31, 38, 44, 90-94, 110, 143, 155-56
- "Curriculum of Library Schools" (New York Library Association), 95-96
- Curtis, George William, 55
- Cutler, (Mary) Salome, 40, 53-54, 83, 204 (n. 5); *see also* Fairchild, Salome Cutler
- Cutter, Charles Ami, 10-11, 16, 22, 35, 37, 39; and *Library Journal*, 14, 41-42; quoted, 26; rules of, 65
- Cutter, William Parker, 71, 115
- Dabney, Charles W., 62
- Dana, John Cotton, 73-74, 92, 96, 146, 185; and Josephson, 81-82, 92; committee member, 98, 101, 133, 217 (n. 32)
- Daniels, Joseph Francis, 76, 165
- Darwin, Charles, 54
- Datz, H. R., 172
- Davenport (Iowa) Public Library, 133
- Davis, R. L., 7
- Dayton (Ohio) Public Library, 89, 119
- Degrees: New York State Library School, 55; University of Illinois Library School, 69; *see also* names of individual schools
- Denio, Lilian, 45

- Denver (Colo.) Public Library, 73-74, 96, 148, 172;  
*Handbook* (Dana), 81
- Dewey, Melvil: and correspondence courses, 128, 174; and graduate courses, 174; and *Library Journal*, 13-14; and *Library Notes*, 33-34; and summer courses, 65, 76; appraisals of schools, 102-4; Carnegie to, 118; "Dewey to Williamson" period summarized, 191-93; establishes School of Library Economy, 1-62; first reference to, 12-13, 199 (n. 46); Fletcher on work of, 80-81; National Library Institute, 122-23; on co-operation, 96; on examination boards, 87, 89; on future of library schools, 129-30; on Illinois State Library School, 69; on men's courses, 116; quoted, 15-16, 17, 77; reaction to the report of the A.L.A. Committee on Library Schools (1900), 95, 98; resignation of, 151
- Directory of graduates (*Library Journal*), 212 (n. 7)
- District of Columbia Library Association, 102
- Dixon, Zella Allen, 72
- Donations, Carnegie policy of, 169 ff.; *see also* Carnegie, Andrew
- Donnelly, June Richardson, 151, 160, 164
- Doren, Electra C., 89-90, 98, 119
- Downey, Mary E., 172
- Drexel Institute Library School, 101, 132, 154, 160; and Kroeger, 107, 143, 144, 151; data from and reports on (1898-1906), 84, 90, 93-95, 108-11, 135; in A.L.A. *Handbook*, 139; practice work at, 159; program of, 67-69, 71, 82, 85
- Drummond, Henry, 54
- Dudgeon, Matthew S., 171
- Early, Maude A., 77
- Eastman, Linda, 172
- Eaton, John, 10
- Education, U.S. Bureau of, 4, 10-11, 45, 71
- Educational Church Board (Albany), 83
- Edwards, Edward, 7, 17
- Elizabeth City, N.J., 150
- Elliott, Julia E., 145-47, 148
- Elmendorf, H. L., 116, 131, 149
- Elmira (N.Y.) Public Library, 72
- Emerson, Margaret Ann, 72
- Employment of graduates (1900 report), 94-95
- Engley, Donald B., 208 (n. 16)
- Entrance requirements: and Association of American Library Schools, 162-63; and college degrees, 100, 191; and Pratt, 166; examinations, 53-55, 56-57, 64; in tract on "Training for Librarianship," 138-39; reports on (1900-1906), 93, 108-9, 124-27, 133-35, 136
- Evaluations of schools, 46, 92-95, 159-60; *see also* Criticism, of training programs
- Examination of schools, 86-87, 100, 157-62, 180-81
- Experience and inquiry, as training methods, 5-9
- Faculty: evaluated, 108; qualifications of, 166
- Fairchild, Edwin Milton, 83
- Fairchild, Salome Cutler, 40, 86, 107, 146-47, 151; and university affiliation, 102, 104, 130; *see also* Cutler, (Mary) Salome
- Fentress, George Washington, 4, 199 (n. 45); quoted, 12
- Fernald, Harriet Converse, 39, 45, 70, 209 (n. 38)
- Fiske, John, 16, 54
- Five-year program, at Washington, 167
- Fletcher, William Isaac, 8, 39, 79, 80-81, 86-88; at Amherst, 65, 71, 208 (n. 16)
- Flexner, Abraham, 158
- Foster, William E., 34-35, 39, 42-43, 55-56, 98-99
- Friedel, J. H., 164-65
- "Future of Library Schools, The" (Dewey), 129

- "General Notes" (*Library Journal*), 14-15
- Geneva, Ill., 72
- George, C. A., 150
- Germany, library science in, 11
- Godfrey, Lydia Boker, 45
- Gooch, Harriet P., 131
- Gould, Charles H., 147-48
- Graduate training, 49-50, 146-47, 173-74, 193
- Graduates, criticisms by and of (1891), 59-61
- Grand Rapids, Mich., 26
- Greeley, Colo., 76
- Green, Harriet E., 59, 61
- Green, Samuel Sweet, 11, 20, 22-33, 35, 42-43, 55-56; and Dewey, 26, 27, 30; lectures of, 39-40
- Griswold, Harriet Sherman, 45
- Guild, Reuben, 17-18, 39
- Gunsaulus, F. W., 68
- Hadley, Chalmers, 74, 148-49, 150, 166, 172
- Hamilton, William J., 171
- Handwriting, library, 45, 205 (n. 33)
- Harris, William T., 101-2
- Harvard College, 7, 16, 23, 25, 62
- Hasse, Adelaide R., 66-67, 92, 96, 164
- Haverhill (Mass.) Public Library, 148
- Hazeltine, Mary Emogene, 76, 152-53, 171
- Henry, W. E., 166-67
- Hewins, Caroline M., 39-40, 56-57
- Hill, Frank P., 9, 57, 97, 98
- "Historical Development of Education for Librarianship in the United States," 1
- Hitchler, Theresa, 128, 179
- Hoagland, Merica, 140, 218 (n. 38)
- Holmes, Henry A., 18
- "How To Start Libraries in Small Towns," 14
- Howe, Harriet E., 218 (n. 45)
- Howland, Anne Wallace, quoted, 1; *see also* Wallace, Anne
- Illinois, training programs in, 72-73, 112
- Illinois, University of, Library School, 68-69, 85, 101, 104, 117-19, 131, 154; and Association of American Library Schools, 163; and Sharp, 102, 107, 151; and Windsor, 153, 166; entrance requirements at, 91, 152; in A.L.A. *Handbook*, 139; reports on and data from, 84, 90, 93-95, 108-11, 132, 135
- Illinois Library Association, 72, 102, 106-7, 128
- Illinois Library Extension Commission, 152
- Imitation, as training method, 5-6
- Indexing and cataloging, queries on in *Library Journal*, 15
- Indiana, training in, 111-12, 132, 135-37, 140, 154, 216-17 (n. 25), 218 (n. 38)
- Indiana Public Library Commission, 171
- Indianapolis, Ind., 21, 140
- Institute training programs, 67-69, 79, 80, 192
- Instructors, meetings of, 153-57
- International Correspondence University, 174
- Intuition, as training method, 5-6
- Iowa Library Society, 63
- Iowa State Library Commission summer school, 111-12, 132, 137, 140
- Italy, library training in, 22, 201 (n. 5)
- Jackson, Annie Brown, 39, 45, 46
- James, Hannah P., 35, 39, 42-43, 88
- Jewett, Charles C., 12
- John Crerar Library, Chicago, 133
- Johnson, Alvin Saunders, 169-71, 177
- Jones, Ada Alice, 45, 53
- Jones, Gardner M., 90
- Jones, John Winter, 22; quoted, 14
- Jones, Mary Letitia, 63-64
- Josephson, Aksel G. S., 81-82, 115, 170; on bibliographic training, 101-2, 167-68; on graduate training, 146-47; proposals of, 78, 90-92, 150, 192
- Junior program (Josephson's), 90-91, 168
- Kansas State Normal School, 132, 217 (n. 26)
- Kelso, Tessa L., 66-67, 73

- Keogh, Andrew, 165  
 Kimball, William C., 133  
 Kindergarten College, 75  
 Kostomlatsky, Zulema, 166  
 Kroeger, Alice Bertha, 68, 107, 143-44, 151
- Lake George (N.Y.) conference (1885), 35-36, 41  
 Lane, William C., 40  
 Larned, J. N., 39, 48, 49  
 League of Library Commissions, 175  
 Lecture topics, School of Library Economy, 39-40; *see also* Curriculum content  
 Legler, Henry E., 133, 140, 143  
 Leigh, Robert D., 1  
 Length of course, 31-32, 109  
 Leyboldt, Frederick, 12, 13  
 Librarians' Conference of 1853, 12, 18  
*Librarian's Manual, The* (Guild), 17-18  
 "Librarian's Work, A" (Fiske), 16  
*Library*, 16  
 Library, Winsor on establishing a, 6-7  
*Library Aids* (Green), 11  
 Library Association (Belfast, Ire.), 79-80  
 Library Association (San José, Calif.), 199 (n. 45)  
 Library Association of the United Kingdom, 14, 16, 201 (n. 5)  
 "Library Bibliography" (Spofford), 10, 16, 17-18  
 "Library Buildings" (Winsor), 11  
 Library Bureau, The, 33, 172  
*Library Chronicle*, 16, 17  
 Library commissions, and Williamson, 171  
 "Library Corner, The" (*Publishers' Weekly*), 12  
 Library economy, queries on in *Library Journal*, 15; Richardson's view, 207 (n. 20); *see also* Columbia College School of Library Economy; Training, library  
 "Library Employment vs. the Library Profession" (Dewey), 37, 61  
*Library Journal*, 8-9, 16-17, 20, 73; and American Library Association, 13-14, 19, 114; and Dewey, 22, 23, 45; and Plummer, 5, 59, 61, 102, 104-5; and Williamson, 173, 175, 180; and Winsor, 6, 8; established, 12, 13; on Carnegie, 118-19, 120; on entrance examinations, 54; on men in field, 116; on training schools, 41-42, 46, 62, 70, 80, 115  
 Library linguistics, 40, 204 (n. 7)  
*Library Notes*, Dewey's ideas in, 16-17, 29, 33-34, 44-45, 130, 205 (n. 34); on correspondence work, 47-48; on entrance examinations, 54  
 Library of Congress, 7, 10, 18, 71, 101, 152  
 Library school as an A.L.A. responsibility, rejected, 122  
 Library school teachers, meetings of, 142-44; *see also* Association of American Library Schools  
 Library schools: and the A.L.A. *Handbook*, 139-40, 219 (n. 15); directors of, and Williamson, 171; examination by Committee on Library Training, 1903, 107-19; from 1911 to 1919, 151-68; *see also* American Library Association, Committee on Library Training; Association of American Library Schools; names of individual schools  
 "Library Schools of Doubtful Value" (Dewey), 103  
 "Library Science: A Special Study at the (German) Universities" (Rullman), 20  
 Library science, as a term, 46  
 Library training agencies, directory of, 132-33  
 Library Training Board, proposal for, 178-90  
 Library training programs, inquiry into essentials of, 191-92  
 Library Workers Association, 182  
 "Library's Maximum of Usefulness, A" (Foster), 34  
 Lincoln, Nebr., 63  
 Linderfelt's rules [*Eclectic Card Catalog Rules*], 65  
*Literary World*, 20

- Literature, reading the, as training method, 9-18
- London conference (1877), 14, 22-23
- Lord, Isabel Ely, 133
- Los Angeles (Calif.) Public Library, 165; *Bulletin*, 65; training class, 64-67, 73, 79, 84, 96
- Lowell, Mass., 9
- Lowrey, Charles Emmett, 80
- Lyman, Edna, 154, 222 (n. 20)
- MacAlister, James, 68
- McGill University, 132, 148
- Macky, Bessie, 68
- Madison, Wis., 77
- Maine, training program in, 63, 70, 80
- Manchester, Eng., 22
- Manley, Marian C., 182
- Mann, B. Pickman, 26
- Marvin, Cornelia, 77
- Massachusetts State Legislature, 4
- Master's degree, Josephson's proposal for, 168
- Meetings of library school teachers, 142-43, 153-57; *see also* Association of American Library Schools
- Memoirs of Libraries* (Edwards), 7, 17
- Men, in training programs and library work, 116, 131, 149
- Menomonie (Wis.) Memorial Library, 77
- Merrill, Chester W., 26
- Merrill, W. Stetson, 102
- Methods: Dewey's circular on, 30; training, 4-21
- Michigan, University of, 7
- Mill, John Stuart, 54
- Millard, Alice G., 131
- Miller, Eulora, 39, 45
- Miller, Hugh, 54
- Milwaukee (Wis.) conference (1886), 37-38
- Minneapolis (Minn.) Public Library, 73
- Minnesota State Library Commission summer school, 76, 103, 111-12, 132, 137, 140
- Minnetonka (Minn.) conference (1908), 143-44
- Missouri, training programs in, 111-12, 137, 186
- "Monthly Notes" (Library Association of the United Kingdom), 16
- Montreal: conference (1900), 92-99, 103; summer school, 131
- Moore, Annie (Anne) Carroll, 83
- Moulton, John Grant, 148, 221 (n. 50)
- Museum of comparative bibliography, 17; *see also* Bibliothecal Museum
- Nation, The*, 20; quoted, 9
- National Board of Certification for Librarians, proposal for, 183-86
- National Education Association, 112
- National Library Examining Board, proposal for, 180-181
- National Library Institute, 122-23
- Neal, Peggy, 14-15
- Nebraska, programs in, 63, 76
- "Need of a Plan for Library Development, The" (Williamson), 173-77
- New Jersey, training programs in, 132, 137, 140, 218 (n. 46)
- New York, 71-72, 130
- New York, University of the State of, 51
- New York City, 86
- New York Library Association, 95-96, 102, 105-6, 115-16, 117
- New York Library Club, 79
- New York *Mail and Express*, 52
- New York Public Library, 120; School, 132, 152-53, 157, 163, 171
- New York Public Library Training Class, *see* New York Public Library, School
- New York State Library, 26, 46, 50-52, 152, 171
- New York State Library School: and Association of American Library Schools, 163; and Carnegie, 118, 170; and instructors' meetings, 154; and New York Library Association, 115; and specialization, 157; comments on, 87, 101, 105; entrance requirements at, 91, 135; graduates of, 119, 131, 148, 160; in *A.L.A. Handbook*, 139, 140; in 1889-93, 50-62;

- in symposium, 143; model for programs, 63-78, 82, 83, 85; personnel, 102, 107, 148, 171; program evaluated, 79-80; reports on and data from, 84, 90, 93-95, 108-12, 132, 135, 137, 191; withdrawal of Dewey from, 129-30, 151
- Newark (N.J.) Free Public Library, 133
- Newberry Library, Chicago, 102
- Normal school courses, 112-13, 157, 217 (n. 26)
- Normal Section, proposal for, 142-43; *see also* American Library Association, Section on Professional Training
- North Carolina, University of, 104
- Northwestern University, 152
- Norton, Charles C., 12
- Norton's Literary and Educational Register*, 12
- Norton's Literary Gazette*, 12
- "Notes and Queries" (*Library Journal*), 14-15, 19, 22, 86
- Number of schools needed (1898), 86
- Oberlin College, 119, 133, 159, 172
- "Object teaching," 30
- Ohio Committee on Library Training, 119
- Ohio Library Association, 119
- Ohio State University, 76, 84, 119
- Olcott, Frances Jenkins, 75, 128, 144
- Omaha (Nebr.) Public Library, 147
- "Organization and Management of Public Libraries, The" (Poole), 11
- Pacific Northwest Library Association, 166, 180
- Passaic, N.J., 133
- Patten, Francis Chauncey, 45, 53
- Periodicals and documents, queries on in *Library Journal*, 15
- Perkins' rules [*A Rational Classification of Literature for Shelving and Cataloging Books in a Library*], 65
- Philadelphia, Pa.: conference (1876), 13; Drexel Institute in, 67
- Pietsch, Dr., 81
- Pittsburg (Pa.) Library, 58; *see also* Carnegie Library, Pittsburgh
- Pittsburgh and Allegheny College, 75
- Plainfield (N.J.) Public Library, 83
- Plummer, Mary Wright: and children's work, 83, 218 (n. 40); and instructors' meetings, 142-44, 155; appraisals of, 102, 104-7; at New York Public Library School, 153; at Pratt Institute, 64-65, 85, 151; committee member and conference participant, 41, 79, 107, 115, 128-29, 133, 139; in *Library Journal*, 59-61; on standards, 123, 158, 192; on training, 5, 161; quoted, 40, 191; student, 43-45, 67
- Policy of Donations to Free Public Libraries, Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York on the* (Johnson), 169-71
- Political influence on library appointments, 8-9
- Poole, William Frederick, 8, 11, 18, 22, 36, 39; and Dewey, 25, 30, 56; opposed to formal training, 25, 192, 202 (n. 17)
- Portland (Ore.) conference (1905), 59, 123, 127-29, 150, 202 (n. 17)
- Postgraduate courses, 49-50; *see also* Graduate training
- Practice work, 38, 110, 156-57, 159, 168
- Pratt Institute Library School: and Association of American Library Schools, 163; and instructors' meetings, 154; and New York Library Association, 115; and Plummer, 5, 105, 107, 133, 144, 151; and *Public Libraries*, 165; and specialization, 157; entrance requirements at, 64, 166; graduates of, 119, 131, 147, 153; in A.L.A. *Handbook*, 139; in symposium, 143; practice work at, 159; program at, 64-65, 67 ff., 82, 85; reports on and data from, 84, 90, 93-95, 108-11, 132, 135; Richardson on, 101; training of children's librarians, 83, 218 (n. 40)
- Preparation, professional, Dewey's views on, 32-33

- "Preparation for Librarianship" (Josephson), 174
- Prescott, William H., 54
- Presnell, Henderson, 71
- "Problem method," 30
- Profession, librarianship as a, 37, 167
- Programs, 46-47, 80, 161; *see also* Curriculum content; names of individual schools
- Providence (R.I.) Public Library, 35
- Public Free Libraries (Manchester, Eng.), 22
- Public Libraries*, 10, 16, 105-6, 115, 130-33, 140, 165; and Ahern, 117, 142-43, 192; and Williamson, 171-72, 180
- Public Libraries in America* (Fletcher), 80-81
- Public Libraries in the United States of America: Their History, Condition, and Management* (U.S. Bureau of Education), 4, 11, 17-18, 20, 22
- Public library training programs, 73-76, 80
- Public library training *vs.* scholars' library training, 60-61
- Publications, on library training, 10-18
- Publishers' and Stationers' Weekly Trade Circular, The*, 12, 13, 16, 199 (n. 43 and n. 46)
- Putnam, G. Haven, 39
- Putnam, Herbert, 84, 86, 89, 99, 128-29, 150
- Qualifications of instructors, 93, 166
- Questionnaire on value of training, first, 59-61
- Ranck, J. H., 217 (n. 32)
- Rathbone, Josephine Adams, 95-96, 149, 171, 184; at Pratt, 151, 166
- "Reading in Popular Libraries" (Winsor), 11
- Reading the literature, as training method, 9-18
- Reece, Ernest J., 171, 189
- "Reference Books in English" (Winsor), 14
- Reference library training *vs.* public library training, 61
- Reminiscences of librarians and training methods, 7-8
- Reports, *see* American Library Association, Conferences; American Library Association, names of individual committees
- Rice, O. S., 186
- Richardson, E. C., 39, 57, 98-99, 100-101, 207 (n. 20)
- Riverside Library Service School, 76, 165
- Robbins, Mary Esther, 64, 107, 160, 161, 172
- Robertson, Josephine Chester, 73
- Robinson, Otis H., 11
- "Rochester University Library — Administration and Use" (Robinson), 11
- Roden, Carl B., quoted, 1
- Root, Azariah Smith, 133, 158, 160, 162-63, 172, 182-83
- Roper Eleanor, 133
- Rose, Grace Delphine, 133
- Rugg, Harold O., 161
- "Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue" (Cutter), 11
- Rullman, F., 11, 20
- Ruskin, John, 54
- St. Louis (Mo.) conference (1889), 55
- St. Louis (Mo.) Library School, 165; *see also* St. Louis (Mo.) Public Library training program
- St. Louis (Mo.) Public Library training program, 153
- St. Louis (Mo.) Public School Library, 8-9, 26
- San Francisco (Calif.) conference (1891), 64, 65
- San José (Calif.) Library Association, 4, 12, 199 (n. 45)
- Sanborn, Henry N., 186
- Saratoga Springs (N.Y.) conference (1918), 171-73, 176
- Sawyer, Harriet Price, 153, 160
- "Scheme of Efficiency Tests for a Library School" (A.L.A. Committee on Library Training), 159, 160-61
- School of Library Economy, *see* Columbia College School of Library Economy

- School of Library Economy of Columbia College, 1887-1889* (Plummer's notes), 43
- Schools: examinations of, 157-62; standards of, 124-27; *see also* names of individual schools
- Schwartz, J., 41
- Sears, Minnie Earl, 95
- Second-year program, Elliott's, 146
- Seminar method, Josephson an advocate of, 168
- Senior program (Josephson's), 91
- Service, emphasis on in Johnson report, 169-70
- Severance, Henry O., 186
- Seymour, May, 39, 43, 53
- Sharp, Katharine Lucinda, 77, 91-92, 104, 107; at Armour Institute, 68; at University of Chicago, 72; at University of Illinois, 69, 102, 151
- Sibley, Henry Orrin, 71-72
- Sibley, Mary Jane, 72, 114, 140, 143
- Simmons College Library School, 107, 154, 161, 163, 165; graduate from, 131; in A.L.A. *Handbook*, 139, 140; reports on and data from, 108-11, 132, 135
- "Simple Lesson in Cataloguing, A" (Appleton), 41
- Simpson, Frances, 117-18
- Smith, Lloyd P., 8, 25
- Smith, Logan Pearsall, 4
- Smithsonian Institution, 12
- Solis-Cohen, Leon M., 131
- "Some Present-Day Aspects of Library Training" (Williamson), 190
- Southern Library School, 132, 135, 216 (n. 64); *see also* Carnegie Library Training School (Atlanta)
- Special Libraries*, 164
- Special Libraries Association, 146
- Specialized programs, 149, 157, 193
- Spectator*, 20
- Spencer, Herbert, 54
- Spofford, Ainsworth R., 16, 17, 18, 70-71; quoted, 10
- Springfield, Mass.: and Dana, 73-74, 96; City Library, 147
- Standards, library training, 122-37, 163, 174, 178-81, 186-87; *see also* Certificates and certification
- Stanley, Henry M., 54
- State Institute (Nebr.), program of, 63
- State libraries, and Williamson, 171
- State library commissions, and summer training, 76
- Statistics, library, 4-5, 10, 63
- Stearns, Lutie E., 127-28
- Steele, Esther Baker, 72
- Stout, J. H., 77
- Strohm, Adam, 145-47
- Students, criticisms from, 117, 130-31
- Subjects of instruction, 30-31, 124-27, 134, 136; *see also* Curriculum content
- "Summer School for Librarians" (Dewey), 65
- Summer school programs, 48-49, 76-77, 132-33, 151-52, 192; reports on, 84, 111-12, 124-27, 136-37, 218 (n. 45)
- Surgeon General's Office, U.S., 25
- Swampscott (Mass.) conference (1921), 184-85
- Syllabus for a Course of Study in the History of the Evolution of the Library in Europe and America* (Simpson), 118
- Syracuse University Library School, 103, 115, 132, 135, 165; and Association of American Library Schools, 163; and instructors' meeting, 154-55; and Mrs. Sibley, 114, 143; in A.L.A. *Handbook*, 140; program of, 70-72; reports on and data from, 108, 135-36
- Tabular Method* (Sibley), 72
- Talcott, Miss, 39
- Tennessee, University of, 62
- "Test of College Efficiency Prepared by Charles N. Cole of Oberlin College," 159
- Tests and credentials, 124-27, 134, 136
- Texas, University of, 103-4, 152
- Textbooks, 33, 143, 226 (n. 36)
- Theoretical teaching, criticized, 61
- Thomas, Henry A., 26



- Thousand Islands (N.Y.) conference (1887), 41, 42-44
- "Three Little Maids from the Library School" (Schwartz), 41-42
- "Three months' students," 31-33
- Thwaites, Reuben Gold, 87-88, 92
- Thwing, Charles F., 118-20
- Tobitt, Edith, 147, 148
- Training, library: concepts of, 145-47; criticisms of, 58-62; during 1901-5, 100-121; during 1911-19, 151-68; formal, 39-52; methods before formal, 4-21; new programs of, 62-78; proposals for, 79-99; standards of, pursued, 122-37; toward formal, 22-38; viewed by Carnegie Corporation of New York, 169-77; *see also* names of individual schools
- Training, need for, discussed at A.L.A. conferences, 19-21
- Training Board, proposal for, 175, 178-90
- Training Class for Children's Librarians, *see* Carnegie Library Training School
- "Training for Librarianship" (A.L.A. Committee on Library Training), 138-42
- "Training for Librarianship" (Plummer), 5
- Training for Library Service* (Williamson), 1-3, 82, 157, 182, 190-93
- "Training for Library Work" (Williamson), 3
- Trans-Mississippi Library Congress, 89
- "Triumphant Democracy" (Carnegie), 58
- Tuition, as a training method, 5-6
- Tyler, A. W., 21
- Tyler, Alice S., 172, 175, 181, 183
- University affiliations for library schools, 81-82, 100, 104-5, 130, 146, 148
- Utey, George B., 171
- Vinton, Frederic, 20
- Wallace, Anne, 86, 120; *see also* Howland, Anne Wallace
- Walter, Frank K., 147-48, 183, 186; and Williamson, 171-72, 176, 179-80; quoted, 1; on specialization, 149-50, 157
- Wandell, Caroline, 104
- Warren, Irene, 131-32
- Warren, Samuel R., 11
- Washington, D.C., 70, 130; conference (1881), 20
- Washington, University of, Library School, 153, 167
- Washington State Summer School for Library Training, 132, 137, 218 (n. 45); *see also* Washington, University of, Library School
- Watson, W. R., 171
- Wellesley, graduates of, 34
- Wellman, Hiller C., 147-48
- Western Library Meeting, 106
- Western Reserve University Library School, 74, 118-20, 132, 153, 157, 163, 172; in A.L.A. *Handbook*, 139; report on, 135
- Wheeler, B. I., 130
- Wheeler, William A., 7
- White, John Burt, 4
- Whitney, James Lyman, 7-8; quoted, 20, 23
- Whittlesey, Julia M., 153
- Wiggin, Miss, 143
- Williams, L. A., 41
- Williamson, Charles Clarence: and American Library Association, 3, 99, 171, 173, 180-90; and Dewey, 57, 203 (n. 46); and examination board, 87; and Johnson report, 170-71; and Josephson, 168; and university affiliation, 82, 148; "Dewey to Williamson" period summarized, 191-93; "Need of a Plan," 171-77; on correspondence work, 48; on faculty, 118; on graduate courses, 50; on men in field, 116; on practice work, 156-57; on professional vs. clerical aspects, 37; on specialization, 146, 149, 157, 161; on textbooks, 143, 226 (n. 36); proposals of, 178-90; quoted, 54-55, 144; survey of library training, references to, 1-3, 67, 69, 74, 76, 120, 152, 153

- Wilson, Albert S., 151-52  
Wilson, H. W., 172  
Wilson, Louis Round, 1  
Windsor, Phineas L., 151-53, 155,  
157-58, 184-86; quoted,  
166-67  
Winona Technical Institute Library  
School, 139-40, 218 (n. 38)  
Winsor, Justin, 6-8, 10-11, 17-23, 34,  
39, 61-62; and American  
Library Association, 26, 35;  
and Dewey, 27, 56; quoted, 13  
Wire, George E., 61, 76  
Wisconsin, training in, 112, 186  
Wisconsin Free Library Commission,  
77, 127, 133, 140, 171, 218  
(n. 37 and n. 39)  
Wisconsin Library Association, 77  
Wisconsin Library School, 132, 135,  
139, 154, 157, 163; Hazeltime  
at, 153, 171  
Wisconsin summer program, 76-77,  
84, 111-12, 137, 140, 151-52  
"Wisconsin Summer School of Library  
Science" (Early), 77  
Women in library training, 42, 51,  
66-67, 70; Dewey on, 34, 39  
Woodworth, Florence, 53  
Worcester, Mass., and Green, 26, 35  
"Words to Starters of Libraries, A"  
(Winsor), 6, 13  
Wright, Purd B., 217 (n. 32)  
Wyche, Benjamin, 104, 152  
Wyer, James Ingersoll, Jr., 76,  
142-44, 151  
Wyer, Malcolm G., 188, 190  
Y.M.C.A. Library (New York), 86  
Y.M.L. Association (Atlanta), 86  
Young, John Russell, 71  
Zachert, Adeline B., 183





















UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



116 484

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY